

STUDIES
IN THE TEXT OF
MATTHEW ARNOLD'S
PROSE WORKS

COMPLEMENTARY THESIS PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY
OF LETTERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

BY

E. K. BROWN

Assistant Professor of English,
University of Toronto.

PARIS
IMPRESSIONS PIERRE ANDRÉ

244, BOULEVARD RASPAIL

—
1935

STUDIES
IN THE TEXT OF
MATTHEW ARNOLD'S
PROSE WORKS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

STUDIES
IN THE TEXT OF
MATTHEW ARNOLD'S
PROSE WORKS

COMPLEMENTARY THESIS PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY
OF LETTERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

BY

E. K. BROWN

Assistant Professor of English,
University of Toronto.

PARIS
IMPRESSIONS PIERRE ANDRÉ

244, BOULEVARD RASPAIL

—
1935



PREFACE

The aim of these studies is to indicate and examine the textual changes in all the prose works of Matthew Arnold, his reports as an inspector and the books which grew out of these excepted. The name of one important work, *On Translating Homer*, does not appear in the table of contents : when Matthew Arnold reprinted the periodical articles of which it is composed, he made no textual changes beyond such trifles as the substitution of a comma for a dash ; and the second edition in book-form did not appear until after his death. Two methods of arranging the material presented themselves : very tempting, at first glance, was the method of arrangement under general headings such as clearness, balance, emphasis, moderation, correction of errors of fact, correction of errors of opinion ; less striking was the method of arrangement adopted, in which each work is considered as a unit. The former method was rejected on the ground that the classifications by which it would operate must necessarily be arbitrary and likely to lead both writer and reader to mistaken conclusions. Its principal advantage has been at least in part conserved by an index. The determination to avoid so far as possible the arbitrary has perhaps resulted in the

mention of many changes of little importance; nevertheless these studies are not entirely unselective and a multitude of minute changes has been passed over in silence.

Throughout the composition of these studies I have had in mind the desire to demonstrate the need for a critical edition of Matthew Arnold's works. As M. Digeon says of his similar undertaking "Mon travail ne saurait en aucun cas tenir lieu d'une édition critique... J'espère seulement qu'il permettra aux fervents... de l'attendre avec plus de patience."

My thanks are due to M. Digeon who most kindly discussed with me the problems which a study of textual changes presents; to the late George Saintsbury and Leonard Huxley who in response to questions gave me information of notable importance; to my friends and fellow-students of Matthew Arnold, W.S. Knickerbocker, Louis Bonnerot and A. S. P. Woodhouse; and above all to Professor Louis Cazamian to whom my debt is too great for adequate description.

Toronto, June, 1934.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	I
I. <i>Essays in Criticism</i>	1
II. <i>On The Study of Celtic Literature</i>	14
III. <i>Culture and Anarchy</i>	17
IV. <i>St. Paul and Protestantism</i>	33
V. <i>Friendship's Garland</i>	40
VI. <i>Literature and Dogma</i>	46
VII. <i>God and the Bible</i>	79
VIII. <i>Last Essays on Church and Religion</i>	88
IX. <i>Mixed Essays</i>	91
X. <i>Irish Essays and Others</i>	100
XI. <i>Discourses in America</i>	109
XII. <i>Essays in Criticism, Second Series</i>	118
A NOTE ON MATTERS OF STYLE	124
CONCLUDING NOTE	128
APPENDIX	130
BIBLIOGRAPHY	132
INDEX	136

CHAPTER I
ESSAYS IN CRITICISM
(FIRST SERIES)

Of *Essays in Criticism* there are four distinct texts, namely (1) the text of the periodical papers collected for the volume, (2) the text of the first edition of 1865, (3) the text of the second edition of 1869 (the *Eversley* edition gives for this the date of 1868, without explanation), and (4) the text of the third edition of 1875. Later editions, (1884, 1886, etc.), were page-for-page, word-for-word reprints of the third edition. No "popular" edition of this work exists.

The periodical papers collected for the first publication in book-form were these nine : *The Function of Criticism at the Present Time*, reprinted from *The National Review* for November, 1864 ; *The Literary Influence of Academies* reproduced from *The Cornhill Magazine* for August, 1864 ; *Maurice de Guérin* which had appeared in *Fraser's Magazine* for January, 1863 ; *Eugénie de Guérin*, *Heinrich Heine* and *Pagan and Christian Religious Sentiment*, which had appeared in *The Cornhill Magazine* for June and August, 1863 and April, 1864, respectively ; *Joubert ; or a French Coleridge*, reproduced from *The National Review* for January, 1864 ; *A Word More About Spinoza*, reprinted from *Macmillan's Magazine* for December, 1863 ; and finally, *Marcus Aurelius*, which had appeared in *The Victoria Magazine* for November, 1863. A long and discursive preface was written for this collection.

In 1869, the eighth essay underwent an important modification : long developments from a paper which had appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for January, 1863, under

the title *The Bishop and the Philosopher*, were cleverly interpolated, and the title of the essay was enlarged to *Spinoza and the Bible*.

In 1875, an additional "essay", the paper *A Persian Passion Play*, which had appeared in *The Cornhill Magazine* for December, 1871, was inserted between the sixth and seventh essays.

When the *Essays in Criticism* appeared in collected form, in 1865, they were introduced by a somewhat confused and polemical *Preface*. The abridgement of this *Preface* in 1869 was the most important modification to which the volume was ever subjected.

Among the passages suppressed was the second paragraph which ran as follows:

I am very sensible that this way of thinking leaves me under great disadvantages in addressing a public composed from a people 'the most logical' says the *Saturday Review* 'in the whole world.' But the truth is, I have never been able to hit it off happily with the logicians, and it would be mere affectation in me to give myself the airs of doing so. They imagine truth something to be proved, I something to be seen; they, something to be manufactured, I, as something to be found. I have a profound respect for intuitions, and a very lukewarm respect for the elaborate machine-work of my friends the logicians. I have always thought that all which was worth much in this elaborate machine-work of theirs came from an intuition to which they gave a grand name of their own. How did they come by this intuition? Ah! if they could tell us that. But no; they set their machine in motion and build up a fine showy edifice; glittering and unsubstantial like a pyramid of eggs; and then they say 'Come and look at our pyramid!' And what does one find it? Of all that heap of eggs, the one poor little fresh egg, the original intuition, has got hidden away far out of sight and forgotten. And all the other eggs are addled¹.

The passage is interesting as an example of the smiling, devastating irony of which Matthew Arnold was an accomplished master. It was suppressed, probably, because it could scarcely be abbreviated and its length was disproportionate to the conception of a preface which Arnold favoured in 1869.

1. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), pp. VII-VIII,

Another and longer passage also suppressed must be quoted at least in part :

Mr. Wright, however, will allow me to observe that he has taken an ample revenge. He has held me up before the public as 'condemned by my own umpire;' as 'rebutted' and 'with an extinguisher put upon me' by Mr. Tennyson's remarkable pentameter :

'When did a frog coarser croak upon our Helicon?'

(till I read Mr. Wright, I had no notion, I protest, that this exquisite stroke of pleasantry was aimed at me); he has exhibited me as 'condemned by myself, refuted by myself' and finally, my hexameters having been rejected by all the world, 'somewhat crest-fallen.' And he has himself made game of me, in this forlorn condition, by parodying these unlucky hexameters. So that now, I should think, he must be quite happy.

Partly, no doubt, from being crest-fallen, but partly, too, from sincere contrition for that fault of over-vivacity which I have acknowledged, I will not raise a finger in self-defence against Mr. Wright's blows. I will not even ask him, — what it almost irresistibly rises to my lips to *ask him when* [supplied by conjecture; there is a blank space in the 1865 edition] I see he writes from Mapperly — if he can tell me what has become of that poor girl, Wragg? She has been tried, I suppose: I know how merciful a view judges and juries are apt to take of these cases, so I cannot but hope she has got off. But what I should so like to ask is, whether the impression the poor thing made was, in general, satisfactory: did she come up to the right standard as a member 'of the best breed in the whole world?' were her life-experiences an edifying testimony to 'our unrivalled happiness?' did she find Mr. Roebuck's speech a comfort to her in her prison? But I must stop: or my kind monitor the *Guardian*, whose own gravity is so profound that the frivolous are sometimes apt to give it a heavier name, will be putting a harsh construction upon my innocent thirst for knowledge and again taxing me with the unpardonable crime of being amusing.

Amusing, good heavens! we shall none of us be amusing much longer. Mr. Wright would perhaps be more indulgent to my vivacity if he considered this. It is but the last sparkle of flame before we are all in the dark: the last glimpse of colour before we all go into drab. Who that reads the *Examiner* does not know that representative man, that Ajax of liberalism, one of our modern leaders of thought, who signs himself 'Presbyter Anglicanus.' For my part I have good cause to know him².

2. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), pp. ix-xi.

The former part of this passage is excessive. The mock-martyrdom in which it consists fatigues, and in fact lapses into an elegant variation of masochism. The latter part of the passage was perhaps suppressed for a material reason : the plight of Wragg furnished some of its most arresting pages for *Culture and Anarchy* published in the intervening years. In any case, vivacious as these developments are, they do not become a preface to a collection of essays in literary criticism.

More regrettable in itself, but aesthetically just, was the suppression of the prophecy of revolution to come — which was subsequent to the above remarks in 1865 :

No more vivacity then ! My hexameters and dogmatism, and scoffs at the Divorce Court, will all have been put down ; I shall be quite crest-fallen. But does Mr. Wright imagine that there will be any more place in that world for his heroic blank verse Homer than for my paradoxes ? If he does, he deceives himself, and knows little of the Palatine library of the future. A plain edifice, like the British College of Health, enlarged : inside a light bleak room with a few statues : Dagon in the centre, with our English Caabah, or Palladium of enlightenment, in the hare's stomach ; around a few leading friends of humanity or fathers of British philosophy — Goliath, the great Bentham, Presbyter Anglicanus, our intellectual deliverer Mr. James Clay, and... yes ! with the embarrassed air of a late convert, the editor of the *Saturday Review*.... Then, for the book-shelves. There will be found on them a monograph by Mr. Lowe on the literature of the ancient Scythians, to revenge them for the iniquitous neglect with which the Greeks treated them ; there will be Demosthenes because he was like Mr. Spurgeon ; but also from all the lumber of antiquity they will be free. Everything they contain will be modern, intelligible, improving : *Joyce's Scientific Dialogues*, *Old Humphrey*, *Bentham's Deontology*, *Little Dorrit*, *Magnall's Questions*, *The Wide Wide World*, *D'Iffanger's Speeches*, *Beecher's Sermons*, — a library in short, the fruit of a happy marriage between the profound philosophic reflection of Mr. Clay and the healthy natural taste of Inspector Tanner³.

This last is admirable : it is precisely in the strain of the preface to *Culture and Anarchy*, where Arnold develops a satirical prophecy of the British Academy to be. We can but

³ *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), pp. XIII-XIV.

regret that in substance and in tone it was not consonant with the context.

The introductory manifesto upon *The Function of Criticism at the Present Time* underwent no organic revision in 1865. New point was given to its already incisive conclusion by two paragraphs, the first and chief of which deals with the critic's duties to foreign literature and contains the dictum, so offensive to Mr. Saintsbury⁴, that English literature of the time was inferior to French and German⁵, and the second of which relates the introductory essay with those to follow⁶.

Some incidental modifications of this crucial paper merit mention and comment : the incident of the old woman, the surpliced minister and the stool is transferred from the "Tron Church" to "St. Giles's"⁷, the High Kirk, but a few yards up the High Street of Edinburgh; "Roman" Catholicism becomes "English and Irish" Catholicism, in which perhaps there is a faint suggestion of a provincial note⁸; a footnote is added upon the practice of critical introductions⁹ and another in vindication of remarks directed against the Bishop of Natal, Dr. Colenso¹⁰. All of these modifications were made in 1865¹¹.

In 1869 a footnote is added in vindication of Arnold's severity to Dr. Colenso, the Bishop of Natal, whose "eight hundred and odd pigeons" had in 1865 been decimated to "eighty".

An interesting polemical footnote added in 1865 and suppressed from the subsequent editions merits quotation :

A critic, already quoted, says I have no right, on my own principles, to 'object to practical measures on theoretical grounds,' and that only 'when a man has got a theory which will fully explain all the duties of the legislator in the matter of marriage, will he have a right to abuse the Divorce Court.' In short, he wants me to produce a plan for a new and improved Divorce Court before I call the present one hideous. But God forbid that I should thus enter into competition with the Lord Chancellor!

4. Saintsbury, *Matthew Arnold*, p. 86. — 5. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), pp. 33-40. — 6. *Id.*, p. 40. — 7. *Id.*, p. 10. — 8. *Id.*, p. 20. — 9. *Id.*, p. 2; revised in 1869. — 10. *Id.*, p. 28. — 11. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 27, n. 1.

It is just this invasion of the practical sphere which is really against my principles; the taking a practical measure into the world of ideas and seeing how it looks there, is, on the other hand, just what I am recommending. It is because we have not been conversant enough with ideas that our practice now falls so short; it is only by becoming more conversant with them that we shall make it better. Our present Divorce Court is not the result of any legislator's meditations on the subject of 'marriage'; rich people had an anomalous privilege of getting divorced; privileges are odious, and we said everybody should have the same chance. There was no meditation about marriage here; that was just the mischief.

If my practical critic will but himself accompany me, for a little while, into the despised world of ideas, — if renouncing any attempt to patch hastily up, with a noble disdain for transcendentalists, our present Divorce Law, he will but allow his mind to dwell a little, first on the Catholic idea of marriage which exhibits marriage as indissoluble, and then upon that Protestant idea of marriage, which exhibits it as a union terminable by mutual consent, — if he will meditate well upon these, and afterwards on the thought of what married life, according to its idea, really is, of what family life really is, of what social life really is, and national life and public morals, — he will find, after a while, I do assure him, the whole state of his spirit quite changed: the Divorce Court will then seem to him, if he looks at it, strangely hideous, and he will at the same time discover in himself, as the fruit of his inward discipline, lights and resources for making it better, of which now he does not dream.

He must make haste, though, for the condition of his 'practical measure' is getting awkward; even the British Philistine begins to have qualms as he looks at his offspring; even his 'thrice-battered God of Palestine' is beginning to roll its eyes convulsively ¹².

This footnote was of length disproportionate at once to the length of the essay, and, which is more serious, to the role of its subject in the development of the essay. In tone, besides, it is discordant: it is a premonition of *Culture and Anarchy* and not an authentic vehicle of Arnold the critic of literature. Much as we may admire its vigour and its verve, its suppression was an example of artistic integrity.

Another footnote, likewise added in 1865 and likewise

12. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), pp. 34-35.

suppressed in 1869, but of minor intrinsic significance, must be quoted in part :

A writer in the *Saturday Review*, who has offered me some counsels about style for which I am truly grateful, suggests that this should stand as follows : *To take as your unit an established base of notation, ten being given as the base of notation, is except for numbers under twenty, the simplest way of counting.* I tried it so, but I assure him without jealousy that the more I looked at his improved way of putting the thing, the less I liked it. It seems to me that the maxim in this shape would never make the tour of a world where most of us are plain, easy-spoken people. He forgets that he is a reasoner, a member of a school, a disciple of the great Bentham, and that he naturally talks in the scientific way of his school with exact accuracy, philosophic propriety ; I am a mere solitary wanderer in search of the light and I talk an artless unstudied, every-day, familiar language. But after all this is the language of the mass of the world¹³.

This is the first quarter of the footnote ; and one may regret that Matthew Arnold did not allow it to flourish in later editions, so smiling in its irony, so studied in its structure. The body of the note is merely polemical but the last quarter also merits quotation :

The French Revolutionists abolished the sale of offices because they thought (my reviewer will kindly allow me to put the thing in my imperfect, popular language) the sale of offices a gross anomaly. We still sell commissions in the army. I have no doubt my reviewer, with his scientific powers, can easily invent some beautiful formula to make us appear to be doing this on the purest philosophical principles : the principles of Hobbes, Locke, Bentham, Mr. Mill, Mr. Bain, and himself, their worthy disciple. But surely the plain unscientific account of the matter is, that we have the anomalous practice (he will allow it is, in itself, an anomalous practice?) established and that (in the words of senatorial wisdom already quoted) ‘ for a thing to be an anomaly we consider no objection to it whatever ’¹⁴.

This paragraph also is desirable, as another round in Matthew Arnold’s life-long bout with the Benthamite technique in social analysis. But it could scarcely survive apart from the paragraph intermediate between it and the passage quoted above. The maintenance of the entire footnote would have

13. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865). p. 40. — 14. *Id.*, p. 44.

been an artistic sin — the meagreness of its contribution to the subject of the essay makes its length quite monstrous.

The paper on *The Literary Influence of Academies*, less general in scope, was subjected to modifications chiefly incidental. In 1869 notes were added in acknowledgment of the *Times*' docility in the orthography of diocese¹⁵; in acknowledgment of Palgrave's revision of his *Handbook*¹⁶; and in qualified defence of an interpretation of Renan¹⁷. In 1865 a note had defended a drastic sentence upon Addison; in 1869, with the parenthetic claim "I detest paradox", excised, it was maintained¹⁸. The most interesting revisions are cuts of the more mordant judgments of Kinglake.

The first in order as in interest is this, cut in 1869:

'His features put on that glow, which seen in men of his race — race known by the kindling gray eye and the light stubborn crisping hair — discloses the rapture of instant fight.' How glittering that is, but how perfectly frosty! 'There was a salient point of difference between the boulevards and the hill sides of the Alma. The Russians were armed.' How trenchant that is, but how perfectly unscrupulous! This is the Corinthian style; the glitter of the East with the hardness of the West; 'the passion for tinsel', some one, himself a Corinthian, said of Mr. Kinglake's style, 'of a sensuous Jew, with the savage spleen of a dyspeptic Englishman.' I do not say this of Mr. Kinglake's style — I am very far from saying it. To say it is to fall into just that cold, brassy, overstretched style which Mr. Kinglake himself employs so far too much, and which I, for my part, reprobate. But when a brother Corinthian of Mr. Kinglake's says it, I feel what he means¹⁹.

Possibly the perfidious reference to Disraeli, whom Matthew Arnold came to admire, offended his taste more than the rough justice dispensed to Kinglake.

From the third edition Matthew Arnold also suppressed these sentences:

The matter of the work is a separate thing; and, indeed, this has been, I believe, withdrawn from discussion, Mr. Kinglake declaring that this must and shall stay as it is, and that he is resolved, like Pontius Pilate, to stand by what he has written.

15. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 53; Arnold had derided the spelling 'diocess', and mentioned its use in the *Times*. — 16. *Id.*, p. 70. — 17. *Id.*, p. 54. — 18. *Id.*, p. 60. — 19. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), pp. 73-74.

And here, I must say, he seems to me to be quite right. On the breast of the huge Mississippi of falsehood called *history*, a foam-bell more or less is of no consequence. But he may, at any rate, ease and soften his style²⁰.

It is very clever, but very disingenuous, the bland cynicism of an Oxford common-room, or at best of the Athenaeum Club. It is not, however, Arnoldian, and the present essay is improved by the removal of a passage in marked discord with its prevailing temper, — with what Matthew Arnold would perhaps have called its “note”.

Another allusion to Kinglake's *Invasion of the Crimea* is modified in compliance with the passage of time and the serial accumulation of that work²¹. Other modifications do not merit mention.

The weight of the paper on *Maurice de Guérin* is borne not by Matthew Arnold's passages of interpretation, but by passages translated from the *Journal* and the *Centaur*. Naturally, then, in revision Arnold's interest was more or less reserved for the correction of the translation; the modifications introduced into it will be examined in another chapter of this work. Among the few modifications of the passages of interpretation, these two invite mention; a cursory allusion to David Gray is expanded to include a munificent compliment to Lord Houghton, the sponsor for posterity of this John Clare of the fifties²²; and the playful first sentence beginning “I will not presume to say that I now know the French language well”, is shorn of its most diverting member, the “now”²³.

The general remarks applied above to the paper on *Maurice de Guérin* may be integrally applied to the companion paper on his sister *Eugénie de Guérin* also. A note was added in 1865 to signalize the publication in that year of a selection from her letters²⁴. The much disputed passage in which Keats and Maurice de Guérin are coupled for comparison and contrast, the passage which so inflamed Enrico Nencione, is attenuated: where Guérin was admitted to have

20. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 71. — 21. *Id.*, p. 70. — 22. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), p. 106. — 23. *Fraser's Magazine*, vol. LXVII, p. 47. — 24. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), p. 120.

"less of sunlight, abundance, and facility", the last revision (1875) wisely inserts "much" before the concessive phrase²⁵.

The modifications introduced into the text of the paper on *Heinrich Heine* are not very significant; a comparison of the present political regimens of England and Germany appeared in 1869²⁶; the status of Byron slumped in 1865 from "nobleman" to "gentleman"²⁷; and the bold dictum which found in the ascertaining of "the master current of the literature of an epoch", and the distinguishing of this "from all minor currents", "the critic's highest function", became in 1865 more prudent when the trenchant last phrase was enlarged to "one of the critic's functions"²⁸.

Modifications of the text of *A Word More About Spinoza* fall into two classes; revisions of the text of the periodical paper which were practised principally on its first appearance in the collection *Essays in Criticism*, and intercalations of matter extracted from the paper *The Bishop and the Philosopher* to which *A Word More About Spinoza* was in its first form an explicit sequel.

Let us examine, first, the revisions of its text. The title was reduced to *Spinoza*, an evident adaptation to the circumstances of its second appearance where its sequential relation is obliterated. In the paragraphs of the essay which were not affected by intercalations, the revisions are insignificant. A reference to the preceding paper in *Macmillan's Magazine* was suppressed²⁹. Two rather pontifical first persons singular were modified; the Spinozistic conception of intellectual life, figured forth in the first two versions as like "a demonstration of Euclid"³⁰ was more inclusively assimilated in 1869 to "a reasoning of Plato"³¹. Other modifications do not invite comment or mention.

In the edition of 1865 the essay *Spinoza* was no more

25. *Essays in Criticism*, (*Works*, Macmillan, 1903, vol. III), p. 133; references to the last revision in Arnold's life time are to this edition except sometimes when the book had but one (or one standard) edition before 1889. — 26. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 157. — 27. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), p. 186. — 28. *Id.*, p. 151. — 29. *Macmillan's Magazine*, vol IX, p. 136. — 30. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), p. 266 — 31. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 276.

than half as long as the shortest of its companion essays. In the edition of 1869, more than doubled, it is of average length. About one half of the paper *The Bishop and the Philosopher*. — the passages relative to the “the philosopher”, — had been intercalated³². They had been intercalated with almost inconsiderable internal revision. Two discursive comparisons were suppressed in the adaptation of the material to its second context. Religion becomes “imposing” where it had been but “venerable³³”.

Much the longest of intercalations is the first of them, an exposition of the content of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, the addition of which gives substance to the essay³⁴. The other intercalations do not affect the march of the essay: they appear only in its conclusion. Their theme is the authenticity and piety of Spinoza’s religious feeling; in their former context, a contrast to the religious feeling of the Bishop of Natal, they are here a rejoinder to the aspersions of a Dutch secularist.

It is indeed an artistic *tour de force* to double in length and decuple in substance, a critical essay, and to do this with material scarcely recast from a former context, without confusing the movement of the essay or blemishing its organic unity. It is significant that in a notice of the second edition of *Essays in Criticism*, which appeared in *The Contemporary Review*, the conclusion of the essay *Spinoza and the Bible*, where grafting had been very delicately achieved, was singled out as a certain triumph of eloquence.

The paper on *Joubert; or a French Coleridge*, when revised for publication in *Essays of Criticism*, was relieved of its specious title, but not of the specious comparison which is, in a sense, its makeweight. From 1865, it is plain *Joubert*. The other modifications of the text of this paper, if numerous, are incidental and even minute. Throughout the paper the pretentious and recurring word “organ” gives way

32. This appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* (vol. VII); the passages incorporated in the essay under consideration (usually with some trifling changes) occur on pp. 246-252 and pp. 254-256. — 33. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 262. — 34. *Macmillan's Magazine*, vol. VII, pp. 246-252.

in all but one of its incidences to the plain "gift"³⁵; a sentence upon the political interest of Joubert was added in 1865; a junctive sentence in 1869; and, in 1869 the cumbersome and objectionable phrase "Joubert's English parallel" was reduced to "Coleridge"³⁶ — a modification four years belated.

The paper originally entitled *Pagan and Christian Religious Sentiment* and from 1865, less ambitiously, *Pagan and Mediaeval Religious Sentiment*, underwent no organic modification correlative with the specialization of the title. It did undergo a few incidental modifications; Arnold's growing disgust with the mechanism of the English Reformation, exploded in 1865 through a splenetic and quite gratuitous parenthesis³⁷; in 1869, partly to comply with the speed of time, partly too, perhaps, with an eye on remote readers "Mr. Panizzi", the bizarre and erudite expatriate who was principal librarian of the British Museum from 1856 to 1866 is generalized to "the librarian"³⁸; the magnitude of St. Francis' experience on Monte Alverno is really revised and more effectively communicated when "doubting" gives way to "assailed, even himself, by the doubt"³⁹, an improvement of 1869; 1869 introduces in two somewhat excessive statements "perhaps" with its attractive accent of perplexity and deliberation; there is, also, in 1869, a reservation placed upon the critical value of Greek poetry⁴⁰; and in the same year, the last, exclamatory sentence to which a critic has rightly taken exception⁴¹ is inadequately mended, — "Let Theocritus or St. Francis beat that!"⁴², becoming "Let St. Francis, — nay, or Luther either, — beat that!"⁴³, a gain in logic, for the presence of Theocritus was anomalous, but no gain whatever in taste or in temper.

The "appreciation" of Marcus Aurelius, one of Matthew Arnold's very few rounded studies in human character, did not, in any revision, undergo organic modification. One

35. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), e. g. p. 222. — 36. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), e. g. p. 245. — 37. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), p. 206. — 38. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 184. — 39. *Id.*, p. 202. — 40. *Id.*, p. 209. — 41. Herbert Paul: *Matthew Arnold*, p. 86. — 42. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), p. 213. — 43. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 209.

long reservation, formerly subordinated, in a footnote, to the otherwise unimpeded flow of eulogy, was in 1869 erected a barrier in the text proper⁴⁴. He had spoken without adequate subtlety of "the Marcus Aurelius one knows"⁴⁵; 1869 brings the substitution of "reads" for "knows"⁴⁶, marking a nice perception of the limited self-portrait of the imperial penitent; the "comforter of scrupulous and difficult yet pure-hearted and upward-striving souls", becomes in 1865 the "comforter of scrupulous and difficult yet pure and upward-striving souls"⁴⁷ and finally in 1869, — and the nuance would have gratified the subject who provoked it, the "comforter of all clear-headed and scrupulous yet pure-hearted and upward-striving men"⁴⁸, an assemblage of qualities neatly representative of Matthew Arnold himself.

Caution is shown in the revision in 1865 of "such a remark as the following seems to me to have no parallel in the whole range of Greek and Roman literature" to "such a remark as the following has hardly a parallel, as far as my knowledge goes, in the whole range of Greek and Roman literature"⁴⁹. The newer form is emphatic where the older was vacuously dogmatic. In 1869, the author of *St. Paul and Protestantism* refines a point of Pauline exegesis: Paul had been claimed to posit "a living emotion" as the source of "perfect moral practise"; in 1869 the quality of the emotion is limited by the adjective "joyful"⁵⁰.

In the revision of *A Persian Passion Play* for the edition of 1875 nothing claims attention.

⁴⁴. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), pp. 314-315. — ⁴⁵. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), p. 302. — ⁴⁶. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 316. — ⁴⁷. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), p. 301. — ⁴⁸. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 316 — ⁴⁹. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1865), p. 292. — ⁵⁰. *Essays in Criticism*, (edition of 1869), p. 286.

CHAPTER II

ON THE STUDY OF CELTIC LITERATURE

Of *On the Study of Celtic Literature* there are probably but two distinct texts, the text of the papers in *The Cornhill Magazine* and the text of the standard edition in book-form which appeared in 1867. I say probably; for although the popular edition, the next in temporal order to the edition of 1867, is posthumous, in a few details it does not reproduce it with fidelity. It returns for its title to the *Cornhill* papers, suppressing the somewhat pretentious "on"; the first sentence of the introduction is adapted to the passage of time; an article is omitted; and the punctuation is drastically revised. It is questionable whether these revisions should be accepted as evidence of a distinct text. Even were they so accepted the status of this text would not be fixed: it is of posthumous publication, and the person of the reviser remains in doubt.

For the remainder of this account we shall concern ourselves only with the *Cornhill* papers for March, April, May, and July 1866, and with their republication, together with an elaborate introduction, in the standard edition of 1867.

A long and important passage upon the function of a modern professor was suppressed in 1867:

It is clear that the system of professorships in our universities is at the present moment based on no intelligent principle, and does not by any means correspond with the requirements of knowledge. I do not say any one is to blame for this. Sometimes the actual state of things is due to the wants of another age, — as for instance, in the overwhelming preponderance of theological chairs; all the arts and sciences, it is well known, were formerly made to centre in theology. Sometimes it is due to mere

haphazard, to the accident of a founder having appeared for one study and no founder having appeared for another. Clearly it was not deliberate design which provided Anglo-Saxon with a chair at Oxford, while the Teutonic languages, as a group, have none, and the Celtic languages have none. It is as if we had a chair of Oscan or of Aeolic Greek before we had a chair of Greek and Latin. The whole system of our university chairs evidently wants re-casting, and adapting to the needs of modern science.

I say, *of modern science*; and it is important to insist on these words. Circumstances at Oxford and Cambridge give special prominence to their function as finishing schools to carry young men of the upper classes of society through a certain limited course of study. But a university is something more and higher than a great finishing school for young gentlemen, however distinguished. A university is a member of a European confraternity for continually enlarging the domain of human knowledge and pushing back in all directions its boundaries. The statutes of the College of France, drawn up at the best moment of the Renaissance and informed with the true spirit of that generous time, admirably fix for a university professor, or representative of the higher studies of Europe, his aim and duty. The *Lecteur Royal* is left with the amplest possible liberty: only one obligation is imposed on him, — to promote and develope to the highest possible pitch the branch of knowledge with which he is charged. In this spirit a university should organize its professorships; in this spirit a professor should use his chair. So that if the Celtic languages are an important object of science, it is no objection to giving them a chair at Oxford or Cambridge, that young men preparing for their degree have no call to study them. The relation of a university chair is with the higher studies of Europe, and not with the young men preparing for their degree. If its occupant has had but five young men at his lectures, or but one young man, or no young man at all, he has done his duty if he has served the higher studies of Europe; or, not to leave out America, let us say, the higher studies of the world. If he has not served these, he has not done his duty, though he had at his lectures five hundred young men. But undoubtedly the most fruitful action of a university chair, even upon the young college student, is produced not by bringing down the university chair to his level, but by beckoning him up to its level. Only in this way can that love for the things of the mind, which is the soul of true culture, be generated, — by showing the things of the mind in their reality and power. Where there is fire, people will come to be warmed at it; and every notable spread of mental activity has been due, not to the arrangement of an elaborate machinery for schooling but to the electric wind of a glowing, disinterested play of mind. ‘Evidences of Christianity!’ Coleridge used to say,

'I am weary of the word! make a man feel the want of Christianity.' 'The young men's education', we may in like manner say, 'I am sick of seeing it organized! make the young men feel the want, the worth, the power of education.'¹

Admirable complement and corrective to the doctrine delivered by Newman to the students of Dublin in the decade before! Admirable in itself, more admirable yet in its adequacy to the practical function it proposed to fulfil, yet in an independent volume on Celtic literature it was a digression that called for suppression.

Other modifications are of slight significance; a number of footnotes, based, chiefly, upon quotations from Lord Strangford, appear; Mr. Whitley Stokes commended as "one of the ablest scholars formed in Zeuss's school" has improved his status and is "one of the very ablest...."²; in 1866 Luther "can not even show himself brave, resolute and truthful, without showing a dash of coarseness and commonness all the while"³; in 1867 the complete negative is modified to "seldom"⁴; "Mr. Lowe's laudations of our matchless happiness and the bank rate of discount at 10 %"⁵, loses the mercantile reference, likely to puzzle later readers; the phrase "a Denbighshire peasant" takes the savoury form "a Denbighshire *statesman*, as we say in the north"⁶ reminding us that Matthew Arnold was by residence and attachment a loyal dalesman of "Wordsworthshire"; the concluding sentences of two of the papers are suppressed⁷.

1. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XIV, pp. 127-128. — 2. *On the Study of Celtic Literature*, (edition of 1867), p. 83. — 3. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XIV, p. 112 — 4. *On the Study of Celtic Literature*, (edition of 1867), p. 140. — 5. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XIV, p. 128. — 6. *On the Study of Celtic Literature*, (edition of 1867), p. 25. — 7. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XIV, p. 483; *Id.*, p. 555.

CHAPTER III

CULTURE AND ANARCHY

Of *Culture and Anarchy* there are three distinct texts, namely the text of articles contributed to *The Cornhill Magazine*, with the titles *Culture and its Enemies* (July, 1867) and *Anarchy and Authority* (in five parts, January, February, June, July, and August, 1868), the text of the first edition in book-form, (1869), and the text of the second edition, (1875), reproduced without modification in the "popular" edition. *Culture and Anarchy*, it will be seen, is a composite title.

More than any other of Arnold's papers, the articles on *Anarchy and Authority* went under the knife. *Culture and its Enemies*, on the other hand, underwent no drastic revision. The explanation of this seeming anomaly is simple : *Culture and its Enemies* was delivered as a lecture before it was published as an article, and when Arnold's lectures were once adapted to publication, they were not ordinarily revised in any notable ways for later editions. The one important exception to this principle, the Rede lecture which was transformed into one of the three *Discourses in America*, will be examined and its uniqueness explained.

Culture and its Enemies, however, was an extraordinary lecture : it was Matthew Arnold's valedictory from the Oxford Chair of Poetry. Therefore it contained a profusion of delicate references to the place and the occasion of its delivery. The case for sweetness and light, here set forth, is suffused with something like that unique charm which Matthew Arnold called "urbanity" when he found it in Newman. So long as this lecture was to be published as an

independent whole, why should its artistic integrity be threatened, why should it be deprived of its peculiar local aroma? Matthew Arnold decided, presumably, that it should be published as it had been delivered, and it was introduced to the readers of *The Cornhill Magazine* with this apologetic foot-note: "What follows was delivered as Mr. Arnold's last lecture in the Poetry Chair at Oxford and took, in many places, a special form from the occasion. Instead of changing the form to that of an essay to adapt it to this Magazine, it has been thought advisable, under the circumstances, to print it as it was delivered."¹

When, however, some two years later, the paper reappeared, no longer as an independent publication, but as the introduction and first chapter of *Culture and Anarchy*, the force of these protective arguments was gone, and the process of adaptation, wisely waived before, was now applied. The second version is, then, really the first *written*, in distinction from *spoken*, version of the lecture. Once adapted, in this second version, to book-form, the lecture remained almost untouched; certain incidental revisions in the edition of 1875 have no interest or importance.

The adaptation to book-form in the edition of 1869 required certain sacrifices as regrettable as inevitable. Most interesting of these is a passage near the end of the lecture where Arnold indulged himself in a charming *confessio fidei*:

On this, the last occasion that I am to speak from this place, I have permitted myself, in justifying culture and in enforcing the reasons for it, to keep chiefly on ground where I am at one with the central instinct and sympathy of Oxford. The pursuit of perfection is the pursuit of sweetness and light. Oxford has worked with all the best of her nature for sweetness, for beauty, and I have allowed myself to-day chiefly to insist on sweetness, on beauty, as necessary characters of perfection. Light, too, is a necessary character of perfection; Oxford must not suffer herself to forget that! At other times during my passage in this chair I have not failed to remind her, so far as my feeble voice availed, that light is a necessary character of perfection. I never shall cease, so long as anywhere my voice finds any utterance, to insist

1. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XVI, p. 36.

on the need of light as well as of sweetness. To-day I have spoken most of that which Oxford has loved most. But he who works for sweetness, works in the end for light also; he who works for light works in the end for sweetness also. He who works for sweetness and light, works to make reason and the will of God prevail².

Only the second and the last sentences survive in the edition of 1869³. An article loses heavily, loses irreparably, when such passages as these are suppressed. The new form of publication had, however, certain compensations which deserve notice. An author has less definite responsibility than a professor : the second version of *Culture and its Enemies* gains by his emancipation from certain responsibilities.

A panegyric upon the spirit of Oxford is tempered by the judicial introduction : " Oxford, the Oxford of the past, has many faults : and she has heavily paid for them in defeat, in isolation, in want of hold upon the modern world " ⁴. He is a shade less cautious in suggesting the perilous state of his own religious convictions : " We are all of us enrolled in some religious organisation or other " sinks to " we are all of us included... " ⁵ " A despairing reference to the mediocre civilizing value of religion in modern society becomes more emphatic : " in possession of it I know not how many years " rises to " in possession of it I know not how many hundred years " ⁶. Mr. Bright becomes " that fine speaker " and continues to be a " famous Liberal " ⁷. The positivists are indulged with parenthetical praise : " however much it (i. e. culture) may find to admire in these personages or in some of them. " ⁸ " In 1875 " Mr. Congreve ", the translator of Comte, rises from " acquaintance " to " friend " ⁹.

The only material modification of interest which is not readily explicable as a use of new freedom is a quotation introduced from Bishop Wilson, but its emergence need not detain us.

The papers on *Anarchy and Authority* went fairly under

2. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XVI, p. 52. — 3. *Id.*, p. 40. — 4. *Id.*, p. 30. — 5. *Id.*, p. 27. — 6. *Id.*, p. 27. — 7. *Id.*, p. 4. — 8. *Id.*, p. 39. — 9. *Id.*, p. 36.

the knife : entire pages were excised. *Culture and Anarchy* is one of the shorter and lighter books of Matthew Arnold. One reads the excised passages together ; one marks their high argumentative and satiric value ; one seeks the criterion which led to their suppression. One discovers it, probably in this passage from the *Preface* to the *Poems*, *A New Edition*, of 1853 :

How different a way of thinking from this is ours ! We can hardly at the present day understand what Menander meant, when he told a man who enquired as to the progress of his comedy, that he had finished it, not having yet written a single line, because he had constructed the action of it in his mind. A modern critic would have assured him that the merit of his piece depended on the brilliant things which arose under his pen as he went along. We have poems which seem to exist merely for the sake of single lines and passages ; not for the sake of producing any total impression. We have critics who seem to direct their attention merely to detached expressions... I verily think that the majority of them do not in their hearts believe that there is such a thing as a total impression to be derived from a poem at all, or to be demanded from a poet.

At a somewhat later stage of the exposition, he enlists Goethe in his support and arrives, with Goethe's aid, at a formula of artistic excellence :

What distinguishes the artist from the mere amateur, says Goethe, is *Architectonicé* in the highest sense ; that power of execution which creates, forms, and constitutes ; not the profoundness of single thoughts, not the richness of imagery, not the abundance of illustration.

Exquisite structure, conducing to an emphatic and distinct total-impression, this was for Matthew Arnold the condition of excellence in poetry and, in truth, in prose as well¹⁰.

Interesting and successful as the passages suppressed may be, their tendency was to disperse the interest, and to obscure, sometimes even to disrupt, the structure. *Anarchy and Authority* was a series of articles written by a compe-

10. Cf. the author's article " Matthew Arnold and the Elizabethans " (*University of Toronto Quarterly*, vol. I, pp. 333-354).

tent polemist, and written rather rapidly by a conscientious official with limited leisure. *Culture and Anarchy* was quite another performance, the performance of one who, polemist and official though he was, remained, when he had a book to do, a conscious and fastidious artist. Other modifications of the text which will bear out this somewhat sheer distinction will be adduced.

It is not practicable or desirable to quote all the suppressed passages in full; it is preferable to describe their general character and present some of their choice developments.

The longest, and perhaps the most valuable, of the suppressions is a passage expunged from the first of the five papers. In the lecture *Culture and its Enemies*, Arnold had permitted himself a patronising professorial reference to the doctrine of the positivists and the characters of their readers. This reference, mitigated, as has been said, in 1869, roused the ire of Frederic Harrison; and the passage suppressed is a dexterous refutation of Harrison. Arnold often played the cat to Frederic Harrison's furious mouse; never did he display his feline ability better than here :

For example, in that very same powerful manifesto in which Mr Frederic Harrison criticized culture, he spoke of 'every hopeful movement being met with the shriek of superstition'; he spoke of the 'bigotry of priests and sectaries'; he spoke of the 'ancient iniquities unabated'; he spoke of the 'men who care for public good wearied out or hunted down'; he spoke of 'the 658 well-bred gentlemen of the House of Commons duping the people, degrading their political tone, stifling public activity, zealous for little but their personal ambitions and class-privileges.' And then he turned to the working-class and said: 'Here are the brightest powers of sympathy and the readiest powers of action!' Now, no one admires this vigorous language, as language, more than I do; but I think it breathes 'violent indignation with the past'. I cannot admit that it is the language of one living (*sic*) [loving?] and 'taking counsel of the past', 'discarding all violent for moral agencies of progress'; or that it 'exactly contrasts with Jacobinism'. On the contrary, it seems to me to be exactly Jacobinical language, as I called it.

Granted that Comte himself had even a 'preposterous veneration for the past', then the English Comtist should be grateful

to me for recalling him to the magnificent ways of his master¹¹.

Whereupon Matthew Arnold proceeds adroitly to disprove any claim of Comte to genuine traditionalism, thus impaling the clumsy English Comtist not once but twice.

Why, he continues, am I to be compelled to publish my own good feelings, and to avow that when I read Mr. Frederic Harrison's strictures upon *Our Venetian Constitution*, the idea rushed into my mind of some enemy, or rival, bringing up against him this text from the sacred volume and charging him with flattering not certainly the patriciate but the proletariat? I figured to myself the odious accusation successful, the youthful Religion of Humanity robbed of one of its choicest ministers and Mr. Frederic Harrison deprived of that promotion in the Comtist hierarchy to which I am sure his zeal and his abilities abundantly entitle him¹².

One more passage must be reproduced, the statement of Arnold's misgivings upon the hypothetical effect of Comtism upon the English national character.

As they have been capable of thinking that vital religion was concerned in keeping the *Crystal Palace* shut on Sunday, or of thinking that it was concerned in exploding (through the instrumentality humanly speaking of Dr. Colenso) the fallacy of the 88 pigeons, so they are capable of setting an exaggerated value upon what in the Comtist faith is formal and ceremonial... so that, here again, the votaries of the new religion have not only no ground for complaining of my misrepresentations, but have, in truth, if they will consider the thing dispassionately, more reason to be pleased with me than to be annoyed¹³.

Disarm your adversary by a stroke in a new style, and as his sword flies from his grasp, inform him that you are the genuine champion of the cause for which he has fought hard, and then request him to thank you for your superiority! The politeness of Matthew Arnold was, as Mr. Chesterton says "enormously insulting"¹⁴. But what joy there is for the spectator to follow the play of the incomparable swordsman, agile, effortless, almost perfidious!

11. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XVII, p. 31. — 12. *Id.*, pp. 31-32. — 13. *Id.*, pp. 32-33. — 14. Chesterton: *The Victorian Age in Literature*, p. 78.

Another attractive and instructive passage in the fifth paper invites quotation :

With me, indeed, this rule of conduct is hereditary. I remember my father, in one of his unpublished letters, written more than forty years ago, when the political and social state of the country was gloomy and troubled, and there were riots in many places, goes on, after strongly insisting on the badness and foolishness of the government, and on the harm and dangerousness of our feudal and aristocratical constitution of society, and ends thus : ' As for rioting, the old Roman way of dealing with *that* is always the right one ; flog the rank and file, and fling the ring-leaders from the Tarpeian rock¹⁵.'

Why was this passage, revealing as do so many of the familiar letters the " Arnoldism " of Matthew Arnold, suppressed, in 1875 ? It occurred in a paper on *Anarchy and Authority* ; and Thomas Arnold was above all things a believer in authority. In a book in whose title " Culture " superseded " Authority " the aptness of such a passage is doubtful ; Matthew Arnold was " above all things a believer in culture ". The suppression of this passage is a remarkable proof of the reorientation implied by the change in title.

At the close of the fourth paper occurred a passage very notable for the ease of its sequence and the limpidity of its style. All that separated it from the end of the paper was Arnold's usual provisional summary of the concluding article and preliminary indication of the article to follow ; this was naturally suppressed in 1869 — in the edition in book-form. What came before the passage which now occupies us and what in 1869, with the omission just indicated, would have come after, are so closely united that they form but one chapter of the book. In the edition of 1869 this passage (which I shall shortly quote) was removed to the conclusion¹⁶. The passage is in two main parts : a criticism of political partisanship and a criticism of religious partisanship. In 1875, the paragraph on religious

15. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XVIII, p. 250 ; cf. *Culture and Anarchy*, (ed. J. Dover Wilson), p. ix : " Why Arnold cut this out in 1875 we do not know, but I suspect that the family disliked it in 1869 ". — 16. *Culture and Anarchy*, (edition of 1869), pp. 250-253.

partisanship was suppressed. There is too little of Attic prose in English that we should suffer such a paragraph to be buried in the rare first edition of *Culture and Anarchy* or in the files of *The Cornhill Magazine*.

... no partisan can afford to be thus disinterested. But we who are not partisans can afford it, and so after we have seen what Nonconformists lose by being locked up in their New Road forms of religious institution, we can let ourselves see, on the other hand, how their ministers in a time of movement of ideas like the present time, are apt to be more exempt than the ministers of a great church establishment from that self-confidence and sense of superiority to such a movement, which are natural to a great and powerful hierarchy; and which in Archdeacon Denison, for instance, seem almost carried to such a pitch that they may become, one cannot but fear, his spiritual ruin. But seeing this does not dispose us, therefore, to lock up all the nation in forms of worship of the New Road type, but it points us to the quite new ideal, of combining grand and natural forms of worship with an openness and movement of mind not yet found in any hierarchy. So, again, if we see what is called ritualism making conquests in our Puritan middle-class, one may rejoice that portions of this class should have become alive to the aesthetical weakness of their position, even although they have not yet become alive to the intellectual weakness of it. In Puritanism, on the other hand, we can respect that idea of dealing sincerely with oneself, which is at once the great force of Puritanism, — Puritanism's great superiority over all products, like ritualism, of our catholicising tendencies, — and also an idea rich in the latent seeds of intellectual promise. But we do this without on that account hiding from ourselves that Puritanism has by Hebraising misapplied that idea, has as yet developed none or hardly one of these seeds, and that its triumph at its present stage of development would be baneful¹⁷.

Why was this passage suppressed? Near an important examination of Nonconformity in the periodical paper for which it was written, in the edition of 1869, transferred to a later part of the book, where the material was chiefly political or social, its presence threw sand in the wheels of the argument and was an impediment, also, to the artistic unity and "total-impression" of a chapter.

The transfer of the above material in 1869 appears to be

17. *Culture and Anarchy*, (edition of 1869), pp. 251-253.

the ground of suppression of a passage inferior in fluency and force but of a similarly conclusive and epitomic character. This latter passage followed at a very short interval the point at which the transferred material was introduced. Only the conclusion of it, admirable in pungency, will be quoted :

If, I say, on testing the present operation of our Liberal friends for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, the truth about it appears to be very much this, then, I think, even with a triumphant Liberal majority, and with our Liberal friends making impassioned appeals to us to take a commendable interest in their operation and them, and to rally round what Sir Henry Hoare (who may be described, perhaps, as a Barbarian converted to Philistinism, as I, on the other hand, seem to be a Philistine converted to culture) finely calls the conscientiousness of a Gladstone and the intellect of a Bright, it is rather our duty to abstain, and instead of lending a hand to the operation of our Liberal friends, to do what we can do to abate and dissolve the mass of prejudice, Tory or Nonconformist, which makes so doubtfully begotten and equivocal an operation as the present producible and possible¹⁸.

Admirable as this passage is in itself, equally admirable as it was in its place in the periodical paper of 1868, in the edition of 1869, coming almost immediately after the transferred passage, it was an anticlimactic conclusion to a weighty chapter. Its disappearance in 1875, along with the paragraph previously quoted, was a remarkable artistic gain.

An artistic conscience inspired the suppression of still another passage, the last substantive passage to be suppressed. Within a few paragraphs of the end of the last paper, in the course of his conclusion, Matthew Arnold introduced an elaborate illustration from his educator's experience. Maintained with negligible revisions in 1869, this digressive matter was suppressed in 1875. The passage is so admirable in itself; it presents such a suggestive and competent contrast between continental and insular method and temper that it deserves to be quoted :

18. *Culture and Anarchy*, (edition of 1869), pp. 255-256.

And even in education, where our Liberal friends are now, with much zeal, bringing out their train of practical operations and inviting all men to lend them a hand, and where, since education is the road to culture, we might gladly lend them a hand with their practical operations if we could lend them one anywhere, yet if we see that a German or Swiss or French law for education rests on very clear ideas about the citizen's claim, in this matter, upon the State, and the State's duty towards the citizen, but has its mechanical details comparatively few and simple—while an English law for the same concern is ruled by no clear ideas about the citizen's claim and the State's duty but has, in compensation, a mass of minute mechanical details about the number of members on a school-committee, and how many shall be a quorum, and how they shall be summoned and how often they shall meet, then we must conclude that our nation stands in more need of clear ideas on the main matter than of laboured details about the accessories of the matter, and that we do more service by trying to help it to the ideas than by lending it a hand with the details. So while Mr. Samuel Morley and his friends talk of changing their policy on education, not for the sake of modelling it on more sound ideas, but 'for fear the management of education should be taken out of their hands', we shall not much care for taking the management out of their hands and getting it into ours, but rather we shall try and make them perceive that to model education on sound ideas is of more importance than to have the management of it in one's hands ever so fully¹⁹.

There could be no better epigraph to the body of Arnold's educational works.

All the substantive passages suppressed have now been singly considered. The junctive passages suppressed, the introductory and concluding sentences of the periodical papers, suppressed in 1869, contain no material or device of note, do not invite comment and do not deserve quotation.

Of the incidental material — as distinguished from stylistic — modifications of the text, one series is pre-eminent: the systematic substitution for the names of men whose fame was unlikely to be permanent or posthumous, of an ironic or satiric term or of their professional or functional quality. This revision occurred only in 1875.

19. *Culture and Anarchy*, (edition of 1869), pp. 267-268; Mr. Dover Wilson pertinently remarks that this passage "was out of date after the Education Bill of 1870" (*Culture and Anarchy*, ed. Dover Wilson, p. 238).

" Sir William Page Wood " becomes " an experienced and distinguished Chancery Judge " ²⁰; " Mr. Bright's brother, Mr. Jacob Bright " becomes " some more ordinary man " ²¹; " Mr. Bazley " becomes " our friend " ²² and " our middle-class member of Parliament " ²³; " the Rev. W. Cassel " whose name Arnold learned to be " Cattle " becomes, before Arnold's blood is up, " a Dissenting minister from Walsall " ²⁴ or, " this Walsall gentleman " ²⁵, then " our truculent middle-class Dissenting minister " ²⁶, " our fanatical Dissenting minister " ²⁷ or " our fanatical Protestant " ²⁸ when he is not merged in the greater notoriety of " Mr. Murphy " ²⁹; Lord Elcho rises from " a well-known lord " ³⁰ or " the brilliant lord " ³¹ to " our chivalrous lord " ³² or " our politest peer " ³³; and " our type of aristocratic perfection " ³⁴; Mr. Bradlaugh becomes " our working men's tribune " ³⁵ or " our popular tribune " ³⁶ or, mordantly, " the popular rioter " ³⁷; Alderman Wilson, Mr. Baxter and Mr. Charles Buxton disappear; finally poor Sir Thomas Bateson varies from the innocuous " a well-known baronet " ³⁸ or " the worthy baronet " ³⁹ or " our aristocratical baronet " ⁴⁰ to " our fierce aristocratical baronet " ⁴¹ or " our defiant baronet " ⁴² or " our type of aristocratic excess " ⁴³; he is even coupled with Mr. Cattle in the phrase " our types of excess in the aristocratic and middle classes " ⁴⁴, and becomes " Barbarian " to Mr. Cattle's " Philistine " ⁴⁵.

This practice of substitution lightens the burden of posterity, unfamiliar with the political and social atmosphere of the " sixties "; it also affords to Matthew Arnold a rare opportunity to express his penchant for irony incisive and not offensive.

Other modifications are incidental; a ritualist had been " handed down from his pulpit ", in the second edition he

20. *Culture and Anarchy*, (Works, vol. VI), p. 53. — 21. *Id.*, p., 68. — 22. *Id.*, loc. cit. — 23. *Id.*, loc. cit. — 24. *Id.*, p. 69. — 25. *Id.*, loc. cit. — 26. *Id.*, p. 75. — 27. *Id.*, p. 80. — 28. *Id.*, p. 82, p. 116. — 29. *Id.*, p. 84, p. 99. — 30. *Id.*, p. 63. — 31. *Id.*, loc. cit. — 32. *Id.*, p. 63, p. 83. — 33. *Id.*, p. 86. — 34. *Id.*, p. 91. — 35. *Id.*, p. 78. — 36. *Id.*, pp. 112-113. — 37. *Id.*, p. 116. — 38. *Id.*, p. 63. — 39. *Id.*, loc. cit. — 40. *Id.*, p. 78, p. 102. — 41. *Id.*, p. 75. — 42. *Id.*, p. 83. — 43. *Id.*, p. 91. — 44. *Id.*, p. 74. — 45. *Id.*, p. 112.

was "hauled down"; the Millite doctrine of social experiment was more briefly presented; a mordant gibe at a reviewer was suppressed; somewhat more important is the addition of a keen analysis of the aureate promises of free-traders.

There remains for examination only the *Preface* written for the first edition in book-form and radically revised for the second. The following polemical passage was, for example, suppressed :

It is by a like sort of misunderstanding, again, that Mr. Oscar Browning, one of the assistant-masters at Eton, takes up in the *Quarterly Review* the cudgels for Eton, as if I had attacked Eton, because I have said in a book about foreign schools, that a man may well prefer to teach his three or four hours a day without keeping a boarding-house; and that there are great dangers in cramming little boys of eight or ten and making them compete for an object of great value to their parents; and, again, that the manufacture and supply of school-books in England much needs regulation by some competent authority. Mr. Oscar Browning gives us to understand that at Eton, he and others, with perfect satisfaction to themselves and the public, combine the functions of teaching and keeping a boarding-house : that he knows excellent men (and, indeed, well he may, for a brother of his own, I am told, is one of the best of them) engaged in preparing little boys for competitive examinations, and that the result, as tested at Eton, gives perfect satisfaction. And as to school-books, he adds, finally, that Dr. William Smith, the learned and distinguished editor of the *Quarterly Review*, is, as we all know, the compiler of school-books meritorious and many. This is what Mr. Oscar Browning gives us to understand in the *Quarterly Review*, and it is impossible not to read with pleasure what he says. For what can give a finer example of that frankness and manly self-confidence which our great public schools, and none of them so much as Eton, are supposed to inspire, of that buoyant ease in holding up one's head, speaking out what is in one's head, and flinging off all sheepishness and awkwardness, than to see an Eton assistant master offering in fact himself as evidence that to combine boarding-house-keeping with teaching is a good thing, and his brother as evidence that to train and race little boys for competitive examinations is a good thing? Nay, and one sees that this frank-hearted Eton self-confidence is contagious; for has not Mr. Oscar Browning managed to fire Dr. William Smith (himself, no doubt, the modestest man alive, and never trained at Eton) with the same spirit, and make him insert in his

own *Review*, a puff so to speak, of his own school-books, declaring that they are (as they are) meritorious and many. Nevertheless, Mr. Oscar Browning is wrong in thinking that I wished to run down Eton : and this repetition on behalf of Eton, with this idea in his head of the strains of his heroic ancestor, Malvina's Oscar, as they are recorded by the family poet, Ossian, is unnecessary. 'The wild boar rushes over their tombs, but he does not disturb their repose. They still love the sport of their youth, and mount the wind with joy.' All I meant to say was, that there were unpleasantnesses in uniting the keeping a boarding-house with teaching, and dangers in cramming and racing little boys for competitive examinations, and charlatanism and extravagance in the manufacture and supply of our school-books. But when Mr. Oscar Browning tells us that all these have been happily got rid of in his case, and his brother's case, and Dr. William Smith's case, then, I say that this is just what I wish and I hope other people will follow their good example. All I seek is that such blemishes should not through any negligence, self-love or want of due self-examination, be suffered to continue⁴⁶.

The Rugbeian son of Dr. Arnold upon the school of Dr. Keate ! Perhaps Arnold inclined to suppress the passage because it was susceptible of such an unpleasant construction. Perhaps, too, its savour seemed to him more Boeotian than Attic ; the allusion to Mr. Browning's brother is both in matter and in manner, provincial. The chief ground for the suppression of this passage was, however, I believe, its digressive quality. It served no artistic or didactic end in the work *Culture and Anarchy* where education is only cursorily examined. The suppression of this, and of so many other passages upon this ground, here and in the later revision of *Essays in Criticism*, points to the progressive control of an unruly talent for digression, to the progressive refinement of an artistic consciousness.

Another polemical passage suppressed from the *Preface* to *Culture and Anarchy* we must quote at least in part :

True, the order and liturgy of the Church of England we may well be contented to live and to die with, and they are such as to inspire an affectionate and revering attachment. True, the reproaches of Nonconformists against this order for 'retaining badges of Antichristian recognisance' and for 'corrupting the right form

46. *Culture and Anarchy*, (edition of 1869), pp. XII-XIV.

of Church polity with manifold Popish rites and ceremonies ; true, their assertion of the essentialness of their own supposed Scriptural order, and their belief in its eternal fitness, are founded on illusion. True, the whole attitude of horror and holy superiority assumed by Puritanism towards the Church of Rome, is wrong and false, and well merits Sir Henry Wotton's rebuke : — ' Take heed of thinking that the farther you go from the Church of Rome, the nearer you are to God.' True, one of the best wishes we could form for Mr. Spurgeon or Father Jackson is, that they might be permitted to learn on this side the grave (for if they do not, a considerable surprise is certainly reserved for them on the other) that Whitfield and Wesley were not at all better than St. Francis, and that they themselves are not at all better than Lacordaire. Yet in spite of all this, so noble and divine a thing is religion, so respectable is that earnestness which desires a prayer-book with one strain of doctrine, so attaching is the order and discipline by which we are used to have our religion conveyed, so many claims on our regard has that popular form of church government for which Nonconformists contend, so perfectly compatible is it with all progress towards perfection, that culture would make us shy even to propose to the Nonconformists the acceptance of the Anglican prayer-book and the episcopal order; and would be forward to wish them a prayer-book of their own approving and the church discipline to which they are attached and accustomed.

Only not at the price of Mialism; that is of a doctrine which leaves the Nonconformists in holes and corners, out of contact with the main current of national life. One can lay his finger, indeed, on the line by which this doctrine has grown up, and see how the essential part of Nonconformity is a popular church-discipline analogous to that of the other reformed churches and how its voluntarism is an accident⁴⁷...

That other and greater prophet of intelligence, and reason and the simple natural truth of things, — Mr. Bright, — means by these, as we have seen, a certain set of measures which suit the special ends of Liberal and Nonconformist partisans. For instance, reason and justice towards Ireland mean the abolishment of the iniquitous Protestant ascendancy in such a particular way as to suit the Nonconformists' antipathy to establishments. Reason and justice pursued in a different way by distributing among the three main Churches of Ireland, — the Roman Catholic, the Anglican, and the Presbyterian, — the Church property of Ireland, would immediately cease, for Mr. Bright and the Nonconformists, to be reason and justice at all, and would become, as Mr. Spurgeon says, 'a setting up of the Roman image.' Thus we see that the sort of

⁴⁷. *Culture and Anarchy*, (edition of 1869), pp. XLIX-L.

intelligence reached by culture is more disinterested than the sort of intelligence reached by belonging to the Liberal party in the great towns and taking a commendable interest in politics...⁴⁸

Why was this passage, so continuously lucid, in its first sentences so massive, in its later so supple and serpentine, suppressed? It is not reproachably digressive. It is perfect in tone and in taste. Yes; but it is long. Even with suppressions, the *Preface of Culture and Anarchy* is one-fifth of the work. In *Literature and Dogma*, in *God and the Bible*, "condensation" meant drastic abbreviations of the *Preface*, together with occasional excisions and alterations in the body of the work. The suppression of the above passage is almost certainly an instance of the refinement of Matthew Arnold's aesthetic consciousness.

There remain the minor modifications of the text of the *Preface*. In 1869 the list of dignitaries, banteringly proposed for a future English Academy, was extended to take in Dean Milman, — a posthumous as well as a dubious honour⁴⁹; the names of Mr. Baxter, Mr. Charles Buxton and the Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Henry Alford) were suppressed in conformity with a criterion of revision widely applied throughout the book; an allusion in Walton's *Life of Hooker* which "not-one half of those who have read it" were conceded to comprehend, has grown even more recondite and comprehensible to "very few"⁵⁰; the cacophonous and polemical "Mialism" gives way to the lucid general phrase "doctrines of disestablishment and separation"⁵¹. More significant than any of these is the limitation of a suggestion for a multiplicity of Church establishments in Great Britain to the single field of Ireland, — a suggestion elaborated in the first of Arnold's *Irish Essays*⁵². More precious in its significance for the intellectual history of Matthew Arnold than any of these additions is the suppression from the peroration to the *Preface*, of this sentence:

Sophocles and Plato knew as well as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews that 'without holiness no man should see God,'

48. *Culture and Anarchy*, (edition of 1869), pp. LII-LIII. — 49. *Id.*, p. XIII. — 50. *Id.*, p. XXXII. — 51. *Id.*, p. XLI. — 52. Cf. *Irish Essays and Others (The Incompatibles)*.

and their notion of what goes to make up holiness was larger than his⁵³.

Between 1869 and 1875 Matthew Arnold had been occupied with the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, he had written *St. Paul and Protestantism*, *Literature and Dogma* and *God and Bible*. He had become less of a Hellene, very much more of a Hebrew. The suppression of this sentence is a palpable evidence of the fact that in the middle "seventies" his Hellenism was at its nadir.

53. *Culture and Anarchy*, (edition of 1869), p. LIX.

CHAPTER IV

ST. PAUL AND PROTESTANTISM

There are five distinct texts of *St. Paul and Protestantism* : the text of the several periodical papers later brought together in book-form, the texts of the three successive standard editions, the text of the subsequent popular and final edition. In its final form, *St. Paul and Protestantism* is constituted as follows : (1) a short preface composed for this edition, (2) the titular essay, in two chapters, preserving its periodical units (*Cornhill Magazine*, October and November, 1869), (3) the essay, *Puritanism and the Church of England* linked with the titular essay since its inception, following it in *The Cornhill Magazine*, (February, 1870) preceding it in the first standard edition, following it once more in the second and third and popular editions, (4) the paper, *Modern Dissent* which appeared in the three standard editions under the caption *Preface*, (5) the essay *A Comment on Christmas*, reprinted for the first time in the popular edition from *The Contemporary Review* for April, 1885 and bearing no significant relation to the other components of the work.

The material modifications of the text of *St. Paul and Protestantism* are numerous, and in many cases, extended. Except in the titular essay, however, where the thought has an admirable amplitude and density, these modifications are rarely notable. Even in this essay almost all the notable modifications were introduced either in the first edition in book form or in the final and popular edition.

Let us, then, consider first the modifications introduced in the first standard edition. The analysis of St. Paul's Semitic

diction and the exegetical implications it conceals, acquires a new point from a contrast, drawn in Matthew Arnold's happiest manner, between Hellenic and Semitic modes of expression¹. The scope and worth of the miraculous element in St. Paul's conversion is astutely discounted by an assimilation of the saint's conversion to that of an illiterate " Methodist soldier in the campaign of Fontenoy " ². The perplexity in which St. Paul's elucidation of Old Testament texts is involved by his facile and illegitimate substitution for an Old Testament term, (e. g. faith), which recurs in a deepened particularized sense in the New Testament, of its New Testament content, — this perplexity is put with much superior clarity ³. On the point of an exposition of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Arnold pauses effectively, to allocate this epistle to its exactly proper place, neither too high nor too low, on the long incline which is the subject of the essay, the incline that falls away from the summit of Pauline wisdom and emotion to the flats of common English and Scottish Nonconformity*. He appears to have enlarged his knowledge of the critical literature relating to this epistle : what he had before described as a " tradition " becomes " Luther's conjecture " ⁴; " some difficulties " rise to " grave difficulties " ⁵; " its central conception " drops to " its apparent central conception " ⁶ and what it once " deliver (ed) " it now but " apparently sanctions " ⁷; what St. Paul had once been able " steadily to put aside ", he is now able only " in reality to put aside " ⁸; finally Apollos, supposed author of the epistle, once " led astray ", is now merely " somewhat overpowered " ⁹. Few passages mark so clearly the limited information from which Matthew Arnold was ready to write on technical subjects. In compensation, few passages in any author testify so strenuously to the integrity of an intellectual conscience.

A significant and attractive footnote was inserted in the first standard edition, anticipating a notorious contention of *Literature and Dogma*, to oppose " literary " to " mecha-

1. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (*Works*, vol. IX), pp. 27-28. — 2. *Id.*, pp. 49-51. — 3. *Id.*, pp. 66-68. — 4. *Id.*, pp. 97-98. — 5. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 6. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 7. *Id.*, p. 99. — 8. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 9. *Id.*, p. 100. — 10. *Id.*, *loc. cit.*

nical " criteria of authorship, entirely to the advantage of the former¹¹. To the doctrine of this footnote, slightly abbreviated in the popular edition, we shall return somewhat later. Less important and less attractive is a footnote inserted in the first but tactfully suppressed from the third and later editions, in which Matthew Arnold contrasts the evangelical rhetoric of St. Paul with the scholastic rhetoric of St. Augustine¹². The temper of this footnote is a premonition of the wrath to come in *Literature and Dogma*. More important by far than any of the above modifications and inviting copious comment is the expansion, from a flaccid inconclusive paragraph to two serried pages, of an exposition of " sacrifice " as the *clef-de-voûte* of Pauline theology¹³.

The immediately obvious outcome of this expansion is an improved distribution of emphasis. In the first version, the three implications of the term " sacrifice " were given in casual succession¹⁴. In the later version the capital third implication takes its deserved primacy. Upon close inspection, Arnold's thought is seen to have been busy in the formulation of a concept which was to remain a favourite with him.

The fresh material opens with a convenient platitude from Bishop Wilson, always a sign that steam is up. The body of the passage is a meditation upon the community of the just with the unjust, the indivisability and penetrability of a society, the certainty that the just man will pay with a great price in spiritual struggle, peril and delay, if the moral standards of the organism which includes him are corrupt or indifferent¹⁵. For Matthew Arnold, — and, as he maintained, in some sense also for St. Paul, — the life and death of Jesus is an affecting apologue of this truth. And, it is worth recalling, this truth is the seed of his doctrine and apostolate of culture. The close of the passage is a superior revision of the close of the paragraph suppressed.

The modifications introduced in the third standard edition

11. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (Works, vol. IX), pp. 98-99. — 12. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (edition of 1870), p. 115. — 13. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (Works, vol. IX), pp. 101-104. — 14. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XX, pp. 617-619. — 15. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (edition of 1870), p. 79.

which we must now examine are on the whole less significant than those examined above.

Let us look first at those which are explicable as reservations introduced either to comply with the change of conditions or with Arnold's growing caution. In former editions Arnold had roundly asserted that the substance of Protestantism was in schemes of doctrine. The third edition limits the assertion to the past, and with this modification it is instructive to compare the main positive statement in the *Preface* written especially for the popular edition a decade later :

"Where is the doctrine of predestination? — gone! Where are the doctrines of original sin, imputed righteousness and justification by faith?... They are fast going¹⁶". An eulogy of "the loveliness of Wesley's character" is now limited to "the loveliness of Wesley's piety¹⁷"; the modified phrase more nearly conforms to the spirit of an allusion, later in the essay to "this amiable and gracious spirit, but intellectually slight and shallow compared to St. Paul". The gain in consistency is notable. An etymological conjecture was introduced in the periodical version with a hopeful "probably"; already in the first standard edition "probably" dwindled into a doubtful "perhaps"; and in the third "perhaps" falls away into an indifferent "some say"¹⁸. Under the pressure of his later Biblical studies, Arnold substitutes for a downright "John", a cautious "the author of the Fourth Gospel¹⁹". Perhaps a personal disillusionment inspired the change from "become one with them and their feelings" to the temperate optimism of "enter into their feelings"²⁰. A refined logical sense reveals itself in the substitution for the causal "accordingly" of the temporal "shortly afterwards"²¹. Taking issue with an oracular conclusion of Renan Arnold had claimed, without racial, national, or geographical qualification, that the reign of St. Paul was becoming more and more effective. The third edition introduces the wise reservation "in our own country at any

16. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (popular edition), p. v. — 17. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (*Works*, vol. IX), p. 23. — 18. *Id.*, p. 42. — 19. *Id.*, p. 61. — 20. *Id.*, p. 71. — 21. *Id.*, p. 83.

rate " ²². It may be entertaining to reflect, in this connection, that the pages of the copies of his religious works which Arnold presented to Renan and which now form part of the Renan Collection in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* at Paris, were almost all uncut, until these copies were used in the preparation of this study. Renan's name occurs four times on the first page of *St. Paul and Protestantism* ²³. The second page was uncut.

Most of the modifications in the text of the titular essay are intercalations of new material or expansions of old, introduced upon its first publication in book-form, the second of its five versions. In marked contrast, almost all the significant modifications in the text of its subsidiary and companion essay, *Puritanism and the Church of England*, consist of suppressions made in the final popular edition. Such a phenomenon stirs more than a languid interest. One seems to detect, not merely a diplomatic intention to lighten the essay and gain for it a popular audience but rather a desire to condense, with a view to subordinating this essay in length, as it had previously been subordinated in position.

Three modifications to which the above remarks do not apply call for special comment. A limpid, persuasive passage, written in the style that enchanted Lewis Gates ²⁴, excuses and at the same time enforces the concession that "Catholicity" is an exclusive property of the Roman Catholic Church. As added in the first edition in book-form this passage was marred by a negligent and useless reference to Fleury ²⁵, sure to puzzle a liberal English reader; this reference was wisely suppressed from the third and later editions. In the third edition, Matthew Arnold also abandoned, sadly, one supposes, but wisely for the reputation of his social insight, a sanguine prophecy that the Athanasian Creed and the Thirty-Nine Articles would disappear from the Prayer-Book in the lifetime of his generation. To the first edition in book-form,

22. *St. Paul and Protestantism*. (*Works*, vol. IX), pp. 1-2. — 23. Cf. the comment on this fact in the review of *Studies in English*, (ed. M. W. Wallace), among which is the author's *The French Reputation of Matthew Arnold*, in the *Times Literary Supplement* for February II. 1932. — 24. Cf. the introduction to his *Selections from Arnold*. — 25. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (edition of 1870), p. 168.

was also added a bland reproach of his old enemy Baxter's taste in liturgical diction²⁶.

The material modifications introduced in the paper *Modern Dissent*, formerly the *Preface*, are more interesting. These fall into two classes; viz: modifications introduced to expand and, usually, to explain contentious references, and, on the other hand, modifications for condensation.

As a preface, this paper contained much contentious material, despatched almost on the run. This material, or aspects of it, came under discussion or passed out of common knowledge. In either case, Matthew Arnold was impelled to offer explanations. These he preferred to confine to footnotes, restrained probably by the desire for concision already evident in the previous subsidiary essay. A rapid reference to "the brutal humour of the Dean of Ripon's famous similitude of the two lepers"²⁷ was no longer readily intelligible when the third edition was published in 1875, and claimed a long footnote. To avoid such a footnote and also, perhaps, to add the spice of suave Arnoldian irony, "the Rev. Mr. Willey said the other day at Leeds" is improved in the popular edition to the form "the Rev. Mr. Willey said to an applauding audience", a tantalizing overture to Mr. Willey's imbecility²⁸. A Dissenting member of Parliament, one of whose speeches is subjected to a fusillade of several pages, died before the publication of the edition. Arnold salved his conscience by a generous footnote in which he distinguished his admiration for the man from his detestation of the man's work, — and maintained the passage²⁹. In the first version Arnold wrote "a sort of mere blatancy and truculent hardness in Professor Fawcett"; in the third edition "Professor Fawcett", is lost in "certain Millites"; and in the popular edition "certain Millites" is generalized to "certain of them"³⁰. In a companion passage the first edition showed "his benchman and apparitor, Professor Fawcett"³¹; in the third Professor Fawcett disap-

26. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (edition of 1870), pp. 136-138. — 27. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (*Works*, vol. IX), p. x. — 28. *Id.*, p. xviii. — 29. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 30. *Id.*, p. xxxviii. — 31. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (edition of 1870), p. xxxviii.

pears as in the previous case and the passage reads " his henchmen and apparitors "; in the popular edition the development of the phrase into " his youthful henchmen and apparitors " ³² exonerates Professor Fawcett altogether. When the popular edition appeared in 1887, Mr. Fawcett had been for two years a member of the choir invisible of positivism; when the third edition appeared in 1875 he was already ageing and blind. No one could desire a more effective proof than these passages supply of the conscience, humanity, and amenity of Matthew Arnold.

Mention must also be made of a single modification of another sort : this was a footnote wisely added in the third edition to quiet certain Nonconformist flutterings provoked by an ambiguous and apparently drastic passage upon the propriety of episcopal ordination ³³.

Of the final essay in the popular edition *A Comment on Christmas*, first printed as a paper in *The Contemporary Review* for April 1885 and in 1887 timorously and incongruously associated with the otherwise admirable unity of *St. Paul and Protestantism*, little need be said. It contains but three material modifications of any scope; and these are readily explicable as examples of Matthew Arnold's steady desires to clarify and to condense.

32. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (popular edition), p. 146. — 33. *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (*Works*, vol. IX), pp. xxv-xxvi.

CHAPTER V

FRIENDSHIP'S GARLAND

There are, most unfortunately, but two distinct texts of *Friendship's Garland*, the most diverting if the least valuable of Matthew Arnold's works. The second edition in book-form was posthumous, (1897), and the so-called popular edition, (1905), is, like the second, a word-for-word, page-for-page, reprint of the first, (1871). The first text of *Friendship's Garland* is its periodical text : the nucleus of the book is a series of twelve letters contributed to *The Pall Mall Gazette* at irregular intervals and upon loosely related subjects of political interest, between July 21, 1866 and November 29, 1870. To these letters Matthew Arnold in 1871 appended a caustic paper *My Countrymen* which had appeared in *The Cornhill Magazine*, not in February, as Smart states¹, but in April, 1866. After this paper comes another letter which had appeared in the *The Pall Mall Gazette* for March 20, 1866. Various additions of original material will shortly claim our attention.

The text of the letters to *The Pall Mall Gazette* was subjected to radical modifications. Certain passages of serious exposition were suppressed as discordant, one supposes, with the tonal unity of the work, so precious where the material collected has little sequence. Three such passages will be reproduced, partly because of their intrinsic interest, partly because of their difficulty of access to-day.

In the second letter Matthew Arnold had written :

'Nature and reason !' cried the Convention orator, these are my gods; and these madmen, if you like, set about remodelling

1. *Works*, vol. XV, p. 365.

society on the principles of nature and reason. If you want to know how they went to work, read the records of the National Assembly for one single sitting — the sitting of the 4th of August 1789. In that revolution was an '*Ernst der inz Ganze geht*', which makes the masses who have felt it, into a people and into a power in the world for ever after².

This is magnificent but it is not *Friendship's Garland*, it is not in the least in the tone proper to such a work. Moreover, such a tribute, applicable enough to the France of 1866, would not flow as readily in 1871, even from a lover of France such as Matthew Arnold remained until a much later date. A discussion of the motives for suppression of such a passage as this would have enhanced the value of Mr. Kelso's somewhat tentative pages on the decline of Matthew Arnold's devotion to France³.

In the fourth letter Matthew Arnold wrote :

Constitutionalism all the world over believes in mechanical expedients rather than in vital force for giving nations strength. Thus your constitutionalism believes in a ten-pound franchise or an exemption from church-rates. Democracy believes more in vital force and with French democracy we can much easier find ourselves in sympathy than with M. Thiers or M. Forcade; and as to our constitutionalism at home, I have not yet quite faith enough in that to wish to leave it all our work to do in the face of a war with France and Bismarck made stronger than ever by such a war⁴.

The speaker, it is necessary to explain, is a Prussian; and the reference, accordingly, is to constitutionalism in Germany. Valuable as a penetration into the interior politics of Germany in the year 1866, it is also interesting, like so much of *Friendship's Garland*, as a ripened judgement of what Matthew Arnold had seen during his studious visit to Germany in 1865. Writing to his sister from Rolandseck, July 17, 1865, he had said :

I saw in Berlin a great deal of Lord Napier, a very able man, or at least a man of a wonderfully active and open mind, and I could see that he thought Prussian constitutionalism a rather

2. *Pall Mall Gazette*, Aug. 4, 1866, p. 4. — 3. Kelso : *Matthew Arnold on Continental Life and Literature*, pp. 23-25. — 4. *P. M. G.*, Aug. 15, 1866, p. 3.

hollow affair, and that he even doubted whether its triumph over the King would be good for the country⁵.

In the year 1871, such an exposition was but a bit of history, not a living issue; and Matthew Arnold was probably well aware that no history is a tithe as tedious as that of the immediate and superseded past.

The conclusion of the sixth letter ran as follows :

Sir, there is an esteemed friend of mine, the Rev. James Fraser, who has convinced himself, after much meditation, that it is the will of God that in England no poor man's child shall stay at school after he is ten years old. And about the education of this poor little shrimp under ten he writes four colossal letters to the *Times*. Positively four bites does the reverend friend take at this very small cherry of his; so as the midnight oil is beginning to run low I hope you will not mind if at my much bigger cherry of compulsory education, I take a second bite to-morrow⁶.

From the standard version all reference to the luckless Mr. Fraser and his mythical cherry is expunged; there remains only the midnight oil, natural accessory to a letter from Grub-Street. The suppression of the reference to Mr. Fraser, would in no other of Matthew Arnold's works be a surprise; but its quasi-vulgarity, its bizarre metaphor, the crude word "shrimp", the almost sarcastic irony, all this is precisely in the tone of *Friendship's Garland*. Why, then, was the passage suppressed? A plausible ground is the doubtful propriety of representing a writer of Grub-Street — this is Arnold's self-assigned Socratic role — as a friend of a Scottish cleric. Another conceivable ground is Arnold's reluctance to give pain where it was not due, a reluctance which made him draw his pen through the elaborate Shaftesbury simile in *Literature and Dogma*⁷.

A great number of the minor material modifications of the text of *Friendship's Garland* were invented to heighten the irony or deepen the satire. Chief among these inventions are the seventeen footnotes, almost every one a miniature explosive. Among the revisions of the text itself which work

5. *Letters*, (edited Russell) vol. I, p. 292. — 6. P. M. G., Apr. 20, 1867, p. 4. — 7. *Cf.* pp. 74-75.

to this end, the following may be cited : " though the classes above it (i. e. the French democracy) corrupt " is intensified to " though the classes above it may rot " ⁸, the acquired force standing in no need of comment ; " a most intolerable thing for an intellectual Emperor " is polished to the superior bland irony of " a most agreeable thing for an intellectual Emperor " ⁹ ; the savagery of English sport, and its factitious conventions, are brought out when a project for a bout is expanded from " arrangements for an encounter " to " arrangements for a systematic encounter " ¹⁰ ; a somewhat surprising Voltairean touch is achieved by the substitution in the following sentence — " Prussia's gracious King gives a grunt, and administers a sound kick to his applicant " — of " petitioner's behind " for " applicant " ¹¹ ; a similar robustious substitution occurs in this sentence — " its future members are probably now at breakfast " — where " at nurse " replaces the final phrase ¹² ; the " five thousandth hare " of the irresistible poacher Zephaniah Diggs becomes his " ten thousandth " ¹³ ; Arminius had " sighed ", he now " retorted " ¹⁴ ; Mrs. Bottles once " loved literature " now she " was kind to " it ¹⁵ ; Mr. Hepworth Dixon is no longer introduced merely as " a great name " but as " a literary star of the first magnitude " ¹⁶ ; continuing the mock-heroic strain of praise Arnold improves another allusion to Mr. Dixon from " great " to " illustrious " ¹⁷ ; and his " regenerating idea of a sexual insurrection " is heightened to his " fine regenerating... " ¹⁸ ; " Coerce them " [those of the middle class] takes the more vivid military form, fitting its ascription to Bismarck, of " muzzle them " ¹⁹ ; " a gross feeder " swells to become " like our own celebrated Dr. Johnson, a very gross feeder " ²⁰.

The change in the Christian name of one of Bottles' daughters from Jemima to Selina ²¹ was probably actuated by the circumstance that the former name was that of an acquaint-

8. *Friendship's Garland*, (*Works*, vol. VI), p. 257. (The first edition of *Friendship's Garland* being excessively rare, it has seemed wiser to refer to the collected edition which has the same text.) — 9. *Id.*, p. 267. 10. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 11. *Id.*, p. 269. — 12. *Id.*, p. 282. — 13. *Id.*, p. 283. — 14. *Id.*, p. 285. — 15. *Id.*, p. 302. — 16. *Id.*, p. 306. — 17. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 18. *Id.*, p. 307. — 19. *Id.*, p. 329. — 20. *Id.*, p. 332. — 21. *Id.*, p. 304.

tance of Arnold, a grand-daughter of Wordsworth, Jemima Quillinan. To her, on the occasion of her sister's death he wrote one of his rare affecting letters²²; and his elegy to her father's memory is a simple expression of authentic bereavement.

No other material modifications invite specific comment; but general mention must be made of a spasmodic effort to condense.

Into the text of the paper *My Countrymen*, Matthew Arnold introduced not one significant addition. All his positive modifications took the form of succinct footnotes, similar in irony, (but rarely hilarious), to those noticed in the body of the work. The continuous practice of the device of witty footnotes contributes more perhaps than any other factor to the formal unity of *Friendship's Garland*.

There were, however, two excisions; and one of the passages expunged deserves quotation in full:

I had been meddling with practice, proposing this and that, saying how it might be if we had established this and that. I saw what danger I had been running in thus intruding into a sphere where I had no business, and I resolve to offend in this way no more. Henceforward let Mr. Kinglake belabour the French as he will, let him describe as many tight merciless lips as he likes; henceforward let Educational Homes stretch themselves out in *The Times* to the crack of doom, let Lord Fortescue bewitch the middle class with ever new blandishments, let any number of Mansion House meetings propound any number of patchwork schemes to avoid facing the real difficulty; I am dumb. I let reforming and instituting alone; I meddle with my neighbour's practice no more. *He that is unjust, let him be unjust still, and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still, and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still, and he that is holy, let him be holy still*²³.

Matthew Arnold seldom let himself go with such vehemence: he strove for calm, and welcomed it when at last it came. Such a paragraph as this corroborates what his poetry suggests: that his nature was intense and, upon occasion, petulant. A calm man could never have written

22. *Letters*, (ed. Russell), vol. II, pp. 124-125. — 23. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XV, p. 153.

Empedocles upon Etna or the paragraph just quoted; a man who strove for calm would have suppressed *Empedocles upon Etna* and this outburst. Browning prevailed upon Matthew Arnold to reprint *Empedocles*; one may regret that Browning did not prevail upon him to set greater store by his crises of intemperate feeling, to use them as opportunities not for repression but for expression. If only Taine who knew him and wrote to him, had persuaded him that a master of criticism should aspire not to the poise of a sedentary emasculate moralist like Joubert, but to an equipoise in which nothing is lost or crushed, where calm remains calm, but storm too remains storm !

Apart from these speculations, it is well to note that Matthew Arnold had suppressed in 1869, the sharper sentences of his famous arraignment of Kinglake in *The Literary Influence of Academies*²⁴.

24. Cf. pp. 8-9.

CHAPTER VI

LITERATURE AND DOGMA

The first text of *Literature and Dogma*, that of the papers which appeared in the *Cornhill*, for July and October, 1871, is only about a quarter of the length of the second text¹. Little of consequence was excised. Three passages only need receive comment. In the first edition in book-form the following passage occurs : " For to do justice and judgment is still, as we have remarked, something external, and may leave the feelings untouched, uncleared, and dead ; what was wanted was to plough up, clear, and quicken the feelings themselves. And this is what Christ did². " In the original this read at greater length ; after " themselves " came these words : " So that the acts which proceeded from them might again be accompanied by the nearly lost sense of going right, hitting the mark, succeeding, — in a word, of happiness. And this is what the gentleness and sweet reasonableness of Christ, his pre-eminent characteristics, did³. " It will readily be recognized that the amplification of the first sentence has, if not an aimlessness, at least a certain desultoriness, that, to use one of its phrases against it, it shows no aptitude of hitting the mark. As for the first version of the second sentence, its heaviness need not be underlined. The excision is a clear gain. In the first edition in book-form we find this passage : " And, in the happiness which thus believing in him, following him, and loving him gives, it finds the mightiest of sanctions⁴. "

1. See the appendix for an explanation of this. — 2. *Literature and Dogma*, (1st. edition of 1873), p. 86. — 3. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XXIV, p. 480. — 4. *Literature and Dogma*, (1st. edition of 1873), p. 102.

This sentence, so simple and emphatic in spite of the evident periodicity of its structure, makes an admirable close for a section. This is what it replaces : " and its sanction in the happiness which thus believing in him, following him, and loving him, gives ⁵. " The awkwardness of this, the ineffectiveness of it as a conclusion, is doubtless what inspired its revision. In the original text this passage occurs :

All the words that belong to his mission — *gospel, Kingdom of God, saviour, grace, living water, bread of life* — are brimful of promise and joy. 'I am come,' he said, 'that ye might *have life* and that ye might have it *more abundantly*'; 'Come to me and ye shall find *rest unto your souls*'; 'I speak that my disciples may have *my joy fulfilled in themselves*'. And the men of Samaria said after hearing him talk : 'This is truly the *saviour of the world*'; his disciples, when he asked them if they meant to leave him, answered : 'To whom should we go? *Thou hast the words of eternal life*⁶'.

In the first edition in book-form, the last sentence disappeared. Its excision is to be ascribed, I suggest, not to the belief that it added no cogency to the claim Arnold is engaged in making, but rather to the perception that it is a shifting of the ground of his argument. The ideas of pleasure and happiness if they occur at all in the affirmations of the Samaritans and the disciples occur in a theological rather than in a psychological form. Other excisions, although some are longer than any of those quoted, are without interest : most of them are explicable by the new form in which the work appeared.

The additions are, perhaps, more significant. All the additions to the first article do not, taken together, amount to more than three pages of the edition in book-form ; they are numerous, however, and only a representative selection will be made the subject of comment here. The longest of them and the most entertaining is the imaginative evocation of the University of Cambridge engaged in the official worship of Venus, a brilliant and ironic passage which

5. *Cornhill Magazine*. vol. XXIV, p. 487. — 6. *Id.*, p. 485.

need not be quoted here since it has survived unchanged in current editions⁷. One may be glad that it did not suffer the untoward fate of the apologue of the three Lord Shaftesburys which in tone it closely resembles. More important as a clarification of the argument is the addition of these tentative sentences :

Probably the life of Abraham, *the friend of God*, however imperfectly the Bible traditions by themselves convey it to us was a decisive step forwards in the development of these ideas of righteousness. Probably this was the moment when such ideas became fixed and solid for the Hebrew people and marked it permanently off from all others who had not made the same step⁸.

The addition of this passage is an important gain since it is a statement of the kernel of Arnold's case for Old Testament religion and a statement which he is here able to make without digression or anticipation. It is desirable to note now, in order not to return to this passage, that in the fifth edition in book-form, the standard edition, "solid" was replaced by "ruling". "Fixed and solid" is merely a double construction, a means of rhetorical emphasis : "fixed and ruling" gives two faces of the idea expressed. In the original text this sentence occurs :

Those *goods* which he thus assigns as the stuff with which human life is mainly concerned (and so in practice really is) — those goods and our dealings with them, our taking our ease, eating, drinking, being merry — are the matter of conduct, the range where it is exercised⁹.

In the first edition in book-form this sentence follows it :

Eating, drinking, ease, pleasure, money, the intercourse of the sexes, the giving free swing to one's temper and instincts — these are the matters with which conduct is concerned, and with which all mankind know and feel it to be concerned¹⁰.

This is an excellent instance of Arnold's expository skill, his anxiety to make his point unmistakeably clear and his

7. *Literature and Dogma*, (1st. edition of 1873), pp. 36-37. — 8. *Id.*, p. 31. — 9. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XXIV, p. 30. — 10. *Literature and Dogma*, (1st. edition of 1873), p. 16.

art — not always so successful as here — in repeating a key-statement without appearing to do so. One of Arnold's cleverest tricks is the timely quotation of sonorous inanities. In the original text he had written :

And it is curious how the feeling of the chief people in the religious world, too, seems to be just now against mere letters, which they slight as the vague and inexact instrument of shallow essayists and magazine-writers, and in favour of dogma, of a scientific and exact presentment of religious things, instead of a literary presentment of them¹¹.

He then proceeded after an apt quotation from the Chancellor of the University of Oxford to the most famous and merciless quotation in *Literature and Dogma*, a quotation which in the course of the book he repeats or alludes to over thirty times, the quotation from the Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester's remarks in Convocation. In the first edition in book-form he prepares the way for this by quoting without comment, directly after the passage quoted above, these two remarks : " Dogmatic theology ; *that is, precision and definiteness* of religious thought ", from *The Guardian*, and " Maudlin sentimentalism, with its miserable disparagements of any *definite* doctrine ; a *nerveless* religion, without the *sinew* and *bone* of doctrine " ¹², from the Dean of Norwich. The value of these quotations here is not merely for their own absurdity of emphasis but in the success with which they stimulate the reader's mind to receive with the desired derision the pretensions and hollow piety of the two bishops.

A few of the modifications of words and phrases claim mention. In the original text we find this passage :

But the valuable thing in letters, — that is in the acquainting oneself with the best which has been known and said in the world, — is, as we have often *said*, the judgment which forms itself insensibly in a fair mind along with fresh knowledge ; and this judgment *any one* with a fair mind who will but trouble himself to try and make acquaintance with the best which has been *known and said* in the world *may attain to* ¹³.

11. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XXIV, p. 26. — 12. *Literature and Dogma*, (1st. edition of 1873), p. 4. — 13. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. XXIV, pp. 27-28.

The words placed in italics underwent change in the following edition. Arnold appears to have felt that this sentence suffers from injudicious repetition. For the first "said" he substitutes "remarked"; for "known and said", which is a repetition from the second line of the passage, he substitutes "thought and uttered". Arnold appears also to have felt that the doctrine of the passage was foolishly optimistic: for "any one" he substitutes "almost anyone", and "may attain to", he expanded to the much less confident "may, if he is lucky, hope to attain to" in which there are two distinct qualifications. The passage which underwent no further revision in subsequent editions is an excellent instance of Arnold's minute care in correction of his text.

"Exercising themselves in the sphere of conduct" is reduced to "exercising themselves in conduct"¹⁴, perhaps because of an unpleasant association in the juxtaposition of the "sphere" with "exercise". "From the Bible such examples can best be taken but we could also *take* them elsewhere" is clearly improved in "from the Bible such examples can best be taken but we *might also find* them elsewhere"¹⁵, which avoids a repetition which almost amounts to incorrectness in the coupling of "take" and "elsewhere". Similarly a harsh coupling is obviated by replacing "conquers peace" by "achieves peace"¹⁶.

There are a number of small improvements in ease and emphasis of which two may be quoted: "Only with the people from whom we got the Bible these distractions did not happen", Arnold had written in the *Cornhill* and this he changed — it is the opening sentence of a section — to "Only with one people — the people from whom we got the Bible — these distractions did not happen"¹⁷. He had also written: "But all this is secondary and comes much later; Israel the founder of our religion knew from thankful experience the *not ourselves* which makes for righteousness and knew how little we know about God besides". In the first edition in book-form this concludes a section. After

¹⁴. *Literature and Dogma*, (1st. edition of 1873), p. 21. — ¹⁵. *Id.*, p. 23. — ¹⁶. *Id.*, p. 27. — ¹⁷. *Id.*, p. 26.

"the founder of our religion" Arnold inserts "did not begin with this. He began with experience. He knew from thankful experience..."¹⁸. How much more easy and fluid how much better calculated to close a development!

The additions to the second *Cornhill* paper are scarcely more extensive. One passage of a page and a half, a long paragraph on the Jewish expectation of the coming reign of righteousness was inserted without disturbing the course or the balance of the argument¹⁹. Among the other changes the most interesting are those which affect single words or short phrases. "Isaiah" becomes more accurately "the unknown prophet of the captivity"²⁰; "the Ancient of Days at his coming" becomes, less poetically but more conformably to the argument, "the Son of Man at his coming"²¹; "Isaiah" in another passage is modified to "the second Isaiah"²². Where Arnold had spoken of the fusion of four personages "David's Son of Man coming with the clouds of Heaven, Isaiah's Holy One of Israel, the Redeemer, this scion of the stock of Jesse... and his meek and afflicted servant of God, who was charged with the precious message of this golden future", in the second text he speaks of only three, David's Son of Man as above, *the first Isaiah's* "Branch out of the root of Jesse", *the second Isaiah's* "Meek and afflicted servant of God"²³. The change is to be ascribed, I should suppose, not so much to a feeling of the difficulty of distinguishing from the other three clearly marked personages the vague "Holy One of Israel, the Redeemer", as to a desire to mark the difference between the concepts of the first and the second Isaiah.

The above represent the changes in substance. Some instances of the changes of pure form must also be given. In the original text occurs this sentence: "Prophets and righteous men, among the Hebrews, preserved always the immediate and truer apprehension of their God as *the Eternal who makes for righteousness* and tried but in vain to communicate this apprehension to the mass of their countrymen." This sentence was skilfully reshaped as follows: "And

18. *Literature and Dogma*, (1st. edition of 1873), p. 40. — 19. *Id.*, pp. 70-72. — 20. *Id.*, p. 74. — 21. *Id.*, p. 77. — 22. *Id.*, p. 83. — 23. *Id.*, p. 92.

though prophets and righteous men among the Hebrews might preserve always the immediate and truer apprehension of their God as *the Eternal who makes for righteousness*, they in vain tried to communicate this apprehension to the mass of their countrymen²⁴. "The gain in unity, in the assignment of emphasis, and in grace is evident. "People all round him were saying" becomes "All around him people were saying"²⁵, a gain in order. In the original text we find this sentence: "The thing was to reapply *emotion* to righteousness and by reapplying it to disperse the feeling of being amiss and helpless..." The weakness here is in the unfamiliarity of the pivotal phrase "reapply *emotion* to righteousness". Note how Arnold works towards a clarification of this: "The thing was, by giving a fuller idea of righteousness to reapply *emotion* to it and by thus reapplying emotion, to disperse the feeling of being amiss and helpless"²⁶. Again, in the original text we find this sentence: "Still in the Old Testament the leaning is to make religion social rather than personal..." which is expanded to this more emphatic form: "Still in the Old Testament it by no means comes out fully. The leaning there is to make religion social rather than personal"²⁷. In the original text a sentence ran: "They learnt too, from observing him and his example, much which without, perhaps, any conscious process of being apprehended in its reason, was discerned instinctively to be true and life-giving as soon as it was *once seen in him*"²⁸. The phrase italicized was replaced in the first edition in book-form by the words: "recommended in Christ's words and illustrated by Christ's example". A simple but persuasive instance of Arnold's art of balance.

Modifications introduced in the second edition in book-form are few and trivial. Only three need be mentioned. In the preface to the first edition the following sentence occurs: "Give a Frenchman, an Italian, an Englishman the same knowledge of the facts, and you could, in general, trust his perception more than you can the German's." In the second edition, after "facts" the following parenthesis was added:

²⁴. *Literature and Dogma*, (1st. edition of 1873), pp. 81-82. — ²⁵. *Id.*, p. 70. — ²⁶. *Id.*, p. 85. — ²⁷. *Id.*, p. 81. — ²⁸. *Id.*, p. 89.

" removing from him, at the same time, all such disturbing influence as political partisanship, ecclesiastical antipathies, national vanity²⁹. " The qualification may well seem serious enough to rob the assertion of all its power : no doubt may be entertained that it was added to avoid ministering to the national complacency or that it primarily modifies the assertion in so far as the *English* character is concerned. The two other modifications occur in the last chapter. " We can see it steadily fulfilling itself " is reduced to " we can see it fulfilled³⁰. " A reference to the Colossians is extended to take in the Corinthians³¹.

No significant change was made in the third edition. For the fourth however the text was extensively revised. In the course of his argument to establish happiness as the aim of human life Arnold wrote in earlier editions :

So strong, altogether, is the witness and sanction *happiness* gives to going right in conduct, to fulfilling, so far as conduct is concerned, the law indicated to us of our being; and there can be no sanction to compare, for force, with the strong sanction of happiness, if it is true what Bishop Butler, who is here but the mouth-piece of humanity itself, says so irresistibly : ' It is manifest that nothing can be of consequence to mankind or any creature, but happiness. '

In the fourth edition in book-form Arnold rounded out his argument with an appeal to an irrecusable authority, a universal as distinguished from an insular doctor :

But we English are taunted with our proneness to a low eudaemonism, and an Anglican bishop may perhaps be a suspected witness; let us call then a glorious father of the Catholic Church, the great Augustine himself. Says St. Augustine : ' Act we must in pursuance of what gives us most delight : *quod amplius nos delectat, secundum id operemur necesse est*³². '

It is significant to watch Arnold here as always seeking the centre, taking his authority and his evidence from the principal rather than the immediate tradition.

It is also in the fourth edition that Arnold inserts in a

29. *Literature and Dogma*, (2nd. edition of 1873), p. xxvii, — 30. *Id.*, p. 375.
— 31. *Id.*, loc. cit. — 32. *Literature and Dogma*, (edition of 1874), p. 46.

footnote a reply to certain criticisms levelled at *Literature and Dogma*. Since this footnote, save for its last sentences, is retained in the fifth and standard edition, it is unnecessary to quote it in its entirety. Only the sentences there suppressed need be given here :

But I had intended to discuss these matters in a review, at the end of the volume, of the chief objections brought against it. I find, however, that to do so would too much increase the size of the present book and too long delay its republication. I propose therefore to notice objections, and amongst them this as to my use of the Fourth Gospel, elsewhere³³.

Here is the genesis of *God and the Bible*, and the clear evidence of its purely sequential relation to *Literature and Dogma*, it is merely an overflow.

The most suggestive, and the most numerous, of the changes made in the fourth edition concern style rather than substance. So numerous are they that it is feasible here only to represent them. Thus, in the third edition, occurs a notable passage :

And the way to convince oneself of this is by studying their [the Hebrew] literature with a fair mind, and with the tact which letters, surely, alone can give. For the theory turns upon understanding the manner in which men have thought, their way of using words, and what they mean by them. And if to know letters is to know the best that has been thought and uttered in the world, then by knowing letters we become acquainted not only with the history, but also with the scope and powers of the instruments men employ in thinking and speaking. And this is just what is sought for.

And with the sort of experience thus gained, objections, as we have said, will be found not so much to be refuted by logical reasoning as to fall of themselves³⁴.

Now in the fourth edition the phrase in the first sentence " their literature " is sharpened to " the Bible "; in the third sentence " uttered " gives place to the " said " customary in the celebrated phrase, a change which is a restoration of the *Cornhill* text ; and, more important, the first part of this

33. *Literature and Dogma*, (edition of 1874), pp. 169-170. — 34. *Literature and Dogma*, (3rd. edition of 1873), pp. 51-52.

third sentence is revised to read : " And by knowing letters, by becoming conversant with the best that has been thought and said in the world, we... ", — a gain in simplicity of order and in grace. In the first sentence of the second paragraph, after " gained " is inserted the descriptive phrase " of the history of the human spirit ", a belated modification made desirable when in the first edition in book-form this sentence opened a paragraph. The superfluous " logical " was excised from the phrase " logical reasoning "; and " fall " in the same sentence was amplified to the more idiomatic " fall away ".

Let us take another and briefer instance of this type of modification. In the first edition in book-form a passage runs thus :

As years proceeded and the world came in to Christianity and the world's educated people and the educated people's Aryan genius with its turn for making religion a metaphysical conception, — and all this in a time of declining criticism, a time when the possibility of true scientific criticism in any direction whatever was lessening rather than increasing, — the popular science was too rude to satisfy³⁵.

Form as invertebrate as this is indefensible. Note how Arnold proceeds in revising it. In the fourth edition the passage opens thus : " Years proceeded. The world came in to Christianity ; the world and the world's educated people... " How patent a gain in clearness and in firmness ! In passing I would mention the substitution for " too rude to satisfy " of " found not elaborate enough to satisfy " — a phrase which enforces powerfully the ironic temper of the sentence, and thus contributes to its unity.

Significant modifications of the substance are rare and three only of these merit comment. A long passage on Pauline theology, a recapitulation of statements originally made in *St. Paul and Protestantism*, was added to the chapter entitled *The Early Witnesses*³⁶. And in this same chapter a more cautious turn is given to Arnold's attitude towards the

35. *Literature and Dogma*, (3 rd. edition of 1873), p. 276. — 36. *Literature and Dogma*, (edition of 1874), pp. 259-260.

authorship of the First Epistle of John. He had written in the first place — and in no edition prior to the fourth had any change been made — that “ The author of the Fourth Gospel is undoubtedly the author of the epistle which we call the First Epistle of St. John ”. He now adds the alternative : “ at any rate the epistle is written by one who had the ideas of this gospel moving his mind ³⁷. ” The scientific scruple which led to such an attenuation is laudable. To the fourth edition belongs also a striking passage in which Arnold powerfully illustrates the puerility of natural philosophy in the early Christian ages, and fortifies his insistence upon the inadequacy of the theology of those ages ³⁸.

The modifications introduced in the fifth edition, the standard edition, are numerous and, especially in points of style, illuminative to the student of Arnold's mind. A careful study of the changes undergone by the preface is particularly rewarding. Let us take first of all these two sentences which in the fourth edition ran as follows :

Of course in a man of genius this delicacy and dexterity of perception is much less lacking; but even in Germans of genius there seems some lack of it. Goethe, for instance, has less of it one must surely own, than the great men of other nations whom alone one can cite as his literary compeers : Shakspeare, Voltaire, Macchiavel, Cicero, Plato.

And compare with this the revision in the fifth edition :

Of course in a man of genius this shortcoming is much less observable; but even in Germans of genius there is something of it. Goethe even, for instance, had less of quick keen tact, one must surely own than the great men of other nations whom alone one can cite as his literary compeers : Shakspeare, Voltaire, Cicero, Plato³⁹.

The slight awkwardness of the “ much less lacking ”, the phrase “ delicacy and dexterity of perception ” which somewhat ineffectively repeats an expression of the preceding paragraph are happily replaced. Emphasis upon the extension of the shortcoming even to Goethe is secured by

³⁷. *Literature and Dogma*, (edition of 1874), p. 263. — ³⁸. *Id.*, pp. 284-285.
— ³⁹. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), p. xxiv.

the interpolation of "even". And the rearrangement of the first sentence permits in the second the introduction of the effective phrase "quick keen tact" where it carries more weight. The suppression of Macchiavel [*sic*] from the catalogue of genius renders it notably less heterogeneous.

Other changes, undertaken in the interests of ease and simplicity, should be noted. The unwieldy phrase "whether the Church shall be connected with the nation in its collective and corporate character or no" is reduced to "whether the Church should be a national institution or no"⁴⁰. The eccentric phrase "habits of the experimental sciences" assumes the normal form "processes of the experimental sciences"⁴¹. The excessive phrase, à propos of Barthélemy St.-Hilaire "dragging in his pompous and false platitudes" is pared to "intermixing his platitudes"⁴².

Some wise reservations are introduced. Arnold had boldly asserted that "the assumption with which all the churches and sects set out, that there is 'a great Personal First Cause, the moral and intelligent Governor of the Universe', and that from him the Bible derives its authority can never be verified". This is modified in its final phrase to read "cannot, at present, at any rate, be verified"⁴³, a formula which suggests a notable change in temper. Speaking of the graver consequences of the spread of infidelity among the lower classes than those which followed upon its spread among the upper Arnold had claimed: "but whereas in the training, life and sentiment of the educated classes there is much to make them disguise the failure [to produce evidence for the Christian scheme of God and a future state] to themselves and not insist upon it, in the training, life and sentiment of the people there is nothing." The temper of this is also modified by the insertion before the final word of "next to"⁴⁴. A similar change was made in a sentence in which Arnold attributes the disposition of the lower classes to conclude from the least evidence of fallibility in the Bible that it is no more than a "priestly imposture", to the mistaken line followed for centuries by theologians. Where he

40. *Literature and Dogma*, (Works, vol. VII), p. xi. — 41. *Id.*, p. xiv. —

42. *Id.*, pp. xxiii-xxiv. — 43. *Id.*, p. x. — 44. *Id.*, p. xiv.

had qualified this strong statement by "to a large extent" he in the standard edition qualifies it further with the phrase "to a certain extent"⁴⁵."

Some modifications of a more substantial kind occur but they are few in number. The most important of them is the addition of one of Arnold's rare remarks in praise of the English genius. He had written: "And without culture we cannot have this experience; although it is true that even culture itself without good fortune and tact will not fully give it. Still, our best and only chance of it is through means of culture [*sic*]" This is replaced by "And an Englishman with the necessary knowledge has in other respects the training likely to give this tact; but without knowledge and culture we cannot have it"⁴⁶. The changed passage comes at the close of a paragraph in which, harking back to what he had attempted in a sketch of national traits in *The Study of Celtic Literature*, Arnold contrasts the English with the German genius. Doubtless he perceived that the lame ending which marred the paragraph in earlier editions could be redeemed by the straightforward expression of the merits of his countrymen, merits on which, when it was avoidable, he disliked to dwell.

Let us take as our next unit that portion of the text which is in the *Introduction* and the first chapter, the unit of the first *Cornhill* article. Most interesting among the excisions is the disappearance of five references to the luckless Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester: the references chosen for excision are, I think, the most ironical. For example: "the word 'God' is used in most cases — not by the Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester, but by mankind in general —" of which the passage between the dashes disappears; "whether in this literary way or in the scientific way of the Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester"⁴⁷, which in the standard edition stops at "scientific way". With the suppression of such passages in which Arnold may have thought he had given rather too free swing to the instincts of his ordinary self, we may take the introduction of mitigating

⁴⁵. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), p. xii. — ⁴⁶. *Id.*, p. xxv. — ⁴⁷. *Id.*, p. 12.

words. In previous editions he had claimed that the aristocracy, the barbarians, "for reading and thinking [they] have in general no turn"; the sharpness of this is modified when the last phrase becomes "no great turn"⁴⁸.

The most interesting addition is a quotation from Izaak Walton which goes counter to the doctrine of natural rights always obnoxious to Arnold⁴⁹. "When such ideas became fixed and solid for the Hebrew people" is improved by the substitution for 'solid' — almost a synonym of 'fixed' — of 'ruling'⁵⁰. A clarifying sentence is introduced in the difficult passage on the scientific theological sense of the idea of God, the sentence which runs "This is the common substratum of idea on which men in general, when they use the word *God*, rest; and we can take this as the word's real sense fairly enough, only it does not give us anything very precise"⁵¹.

As our next unit let us take that portion of the text which corresponds with the second *Cornhill* paper: the chapters, *Aberglaube Invading, Religion New-Given*, and *The Proof from Prophecy*. Modifications in these chapters are both less numerous and less significant. There is, indeed, no change of substance important enough to reward study. Among changes of stylistic interest there is the expansion of "fashioned" to "formed and fashioned"⁵² and of "roundly" to "roundly and confidently"⁵³. Purely musical also is the change of "wonder of prediction" to "prodigy of prediction"⁵⁴, with which we may join the change of the final phrase of the chapter which precedes those entitled *The Proof from Prophecy* and *The Proof from Miracles*: where Arnold had written "they more and more rested the proof of Christianity, not on its internal evidence, but on prediction and miracle", he now replaces "prediction" by "prophecy"⁵⁵. In the *Cornhill* text where there were no chapter-headings it was immaterial whether he wrote "prediction" or "prophecy"; it is odd, however, that it should not have been before the fifth edition in book-form that he perceived the

48. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), p. 2. — 49. *Id.*, p. 40. — 50. *Id.*, p. 31. — 51. *Id.*, p. 13. — 52. *Id.*, p. 92. — 53. *Id.*, p. 112. — 54. *Id.*, p. 110. — 55. *Id.*, p. 106.

superiority of "prophecy" as pointing forward to the title of the next chapter. Another modification which illustrates Arnold's rhetorical art is this: in the previous editions he had written "Christ's new and different way of putting things was the secret of his succeeding where the prophets could not" (in the fourth edition "Christ" was expanded to "Jesus Christ"); in the fifth edition the rather halting "could not" is replaced by "failed", forth-right and emphatic⁵⁶. The substitution of "obtain" for "attain" in the phrase "so difficult of attainment that it seems we cannot attain it of our selves"⁵⁷ is possibly a printer's error and, if not, a correction hastily made without due consideration of the context.

We now proceed to chapter five, *The Proof from Miracles*. Where Arnold had written "we have seen that the making religion into metaphysics is the weakening of religion", he now by changing the tense of the verb and writing "we see every day"⁵⁸ greatly increases the vividness of his observation. And a few sentences farther on in the statement: "This is the case with the metaphysics of our bishops and it will be the same with M. Burnouf's new metaphysics also," by inserting "old" before "metaphysics of our bishops" he at once improves the balance of the sentence and heightens the expression of scorn⁵⁹. The slight change from the plural to the singular in the sentence which had stood: "Popular religion rests it [the existence of a personal God] on *miracles*"⁶⁰, by generalizing the idea gives it greater philosophic weight. Concerning the belief that the opening of a passage over the Red Sea was a miraculous interposition, Arnold had written "insist on the literal truth of *this* story, and reject natural explanations as monstrous". It is not too severe to condemn the antithesis between "natural" and "monstrous" as an unscrupulous rhetorical effect, dependent on the double meaning of "monstrous". In the fifth edition "monstrous" is replaced by "impious"⁶¹; if immediate effectiveness is sacrificed, the sacrifice is in the interest of honesty and clarity.

⁵⁶. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), p. 87. — ⁵⁷. *Id.*, p. 100. — ⁵⁸. *Id.*, p. 121. — ⁵⁹. *Id.*, p. 122. — ⁶⁰. *Id.*, p. 123. — ⁶¹. *Id.*, p. 131.

Infinitely more considerable than any of these modifications are those introduced in the sentence which had declared: "For the Catholic notion admits miracles in the mass; the Protestant notion invites to a criticism by which it must finally itself perish." This was revised to read: "For the Catholic notion admits miracles, — as far as Christianity at least, is concerned, — in the mass; the Protestant notion invites to a criticism by which it must before long itself perish."⁶² The replacement of "finally" by "before long", like many other modifications in the studies in religious criticism, marks Arnold's growing conviction of the perilous estate of "Bible-religion"; and, if I read it aright, the ostensibly polite modification of the first half of the sentence is a quiet suggestion that the Catholic circumscription of the range of miracle is, if less narrow, no less arbitrary and indefensible than the Protestant.

All but the first sentence of the first paragraph in the standard and subsequent editions of the chapter *The New Testament Record* appear in this edition for the first time⁶³. The added sentences constitute a preliminary statement of the thesis to whose proof the chapter is devoted, — the thesis that the greatness of Jesus is incommensurable and beyond the range of his reporters' apprehension. Other changes in the chapter are rather trivial. The verb "experience" is replaced twice by the more vivid phrase "feel the force of"; where "his disciples *experienced* the evidence" they are now said to have "felt the force of the evidence", and two sentences farther on "experiencing a theory" becomes "feeling the force of a theory"⁶⁴. The phrase "other regions of work than criticism of the Bible" is changed to "other departments of work than criticism of the Bible"⁶⁵; and the following sentence is similarly modified. This is a clear gain; for the word "region" was improperly or at least unidiomatically used. Where Arnold had spoken of using a clue "as well as possible", he now more precisely says "as profitably as possible"⁶⁶. The modifications of meaning are perhaps more important. One

⁶². *Literature and Dogma*, (Works, vol. VII), p. 130. — ⁶³. *Id.*, p. 148. — ⁶⁴. *Id.*, p. 158. — ⁶⁵. *Id.*, p. 178. — ⁶⁶. *Id.*, p. 175.

of these is a correction of fact : a remark of Christ's had been described as a reference to Zachariah, it is now, rightly, referred to "the second Isaiah" ⁶⁷. What had been condemned as "an error of Schleiermacher's" — a personage for whom Arnold had a profound respect — is now described merely as his "fancy" ⁶⁸. Arnold's respect for Renan is demonstrated in a sentence where speaking of Ewald he had written : "his superiority here to the best of his rivals, Baur, Dr. Strauss, M. Renan". In the standard edition Renan is distinguished above his companions in error by the insertion before his name of the phrase "and even" ⁶⁹. In Arnold's insistence on the relatively slight interest of inquiries into "the exact date, the real authorship, the first publication, the rank of priority of the Gospels" he had admitted that such inquiries were "in themselves good to be entertained". In the standard edition by inserting "perhaps" immediately before the phrase quoted he greatly conditions what he admits ⁷⁰.

We come now to the very long seventh chapter *The Testimony of Jesus to Himself*. Among minor ameliorations of style let us note the substitution for "... make this maxim of Lord Salisbury's go on all fours" of the more elegant "make this maxim of Lord Salisbury's indisputable" ⁷¹; the reduction of the phrase "neither joyful nor blessed nor at peace" to "neither blessed nor at peace" ⁷²; the substitution of "bemoaning" for "lamenting" ⁷³ and of "deference" for "respect" ⁷⁴ to avert awkward repetition; the replacement of "sensibly" by "practically" in the unidiomatic phrase "we find the rule of renouncement lead sensibly up to it", further improved by a transposition of verb and adverb ⁷⁵; the insertion contributory to both clarity and balance of "stretching" after "dominion" in the following phrase : "With his dominion from one sea to the other, all things falling down before him, all nations serving him" ⁷⁶.

We may now pass to modifications in the substance. In

⁶⁷. *Literature and Dogma*, (Works, vol. VII), p. 173. — ⁶⁸. *Id.*, p. 165. — ⁶⁹. *Id.*, p. 169. — ⁷⁰. *Id.*, p. 161. — ⁷¹. *Id.*, p. 182. — ⁷². *Id.*, p. 193. — ⁷³. *Id.*, p. 196. — ⁷⁴. *Id.*, p. 233. — ⁷⁵. *Id.*, p. 209. — ⁷⁶. *Id.*, p. 218.

speaking of the incidence in the New Testament of the prophecies in the Old, Arnold had mentioned them as "given us"; hereafter they are more accurately stated to be merely "indicated to us"⁷⁷. A similarly slight modification in the interest of accuracy is the revision of the phrase "the popular religious hope and belief of the Jews" to "the popular religious belief and expectation of the Jews"⁷⁸. Emphasizing what throughout his religious writings is always his main apologetic for Christianity he expands the remark "as Jesus was always saying" to "as Jesus said, and as men's commonsense and proverbial speech say with him"⁷⁹. The portrait of a sweetly reasonable Jesus becomes more impressive when Arnold calls attention in a footnote to Bossuet's characterization of him as "*le débonnaire Jésus*" and to Cowper's allusion to his "kind engaging air"⁸⁰. A false antithesis between the true and the mistaken conception of Jesus as Messiah is removed by a junctive clause⁸¹.

One passage towards the end of the chapter was almost completely rewritten. In the previous edition it had read :

He had said he should be put to death, and the death of the worst malefactors, crucifixion. He had said he should be thus perfected after he had worked but a little while longer : *I do cures to-day and to-morrow and the third day I shall be perfected*. Nothing more was needed. The miraculous prediction concerning 'the temple of his body' was ready to the miracle-writer's hand! Jesus had said...

As revised for the standard edition it reads :

He had said he should be put to death, and the death of the worst malefactors, crucifixion. This death he had also called his glorification, his perfection. He had said, using a Hebrew form of expression that his perfection or glorification should come in three days (that is, very shortly) : *I do cures to-day and to-morrow and the third day I shall be perfected*. Nothing more was needed. All the elements for a simply miraculous prediction by Jesus of his own death and bodily resurrection were ready to the miracle maker's hand! Jesus had not only said : they shall crucify me and the third day I will rise again. He had also said, pointing to his own body⁸²...

77. *Literature and Dogma*, (Works, vol. VII), p. 187. — 78. *Id.*, p. 188. — 79. *Id.*, p. 203. — 80. *Id.*, p. 215. — 81. *Id.*, p. 225. — 82. *Id.*, p. 242.

It would not be easy to find a clearer example of Arnold's skill in revision. The argument becomes more convincing when the omitted elements are brought directly before us. The terms — especially that of "perfection" — become more readily intelligible by being prepared. And the significance of the phrase "the third day", a key phrase, is adumbrated with equal skill. As in other chapters the majority of the references to the Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester were excised. What is perhaps the most charmingly ironical of all was not spared: "It was the same Muse, no doubt, who visits the Bishop of Gloucester when he sits in his palace meditating on personality, or sometimes, perhaps, in his lighter hours, on political economy"⁸³.

Of the eighth chapter *The Early Witnesses* the standard edition gives the final form: it was omitted from the popular edition. The modifications introduced in this chapter are predominantly modifications of meaning. In previous editions Arnold had averred that it was almost as certain that the first epistle of Peter was Peter's as that the second epistle of Peter was not. The phrase "almost as certainly" is strengthened to "as much, one may say"⁸⁴ in which for all the tentativeness of the locution, there is more assurance. A false ascription of a passage from Paul is corrected: where Arnold had written in error "Corinthians" he now has "Galatians"⁸⁵.

Prior to the fourth edition a sentence had read: "Now, the author of the Fourth Gospel had a turn, as we have seen, for metaphysics". In the fourth edition Arnold had added: "and the author of the First Epistle of St. John had the same." In the fifth this latter phrase is prudently altered to: "shows a conversance with the ideas of the Fourth Gospel"⁸⁶, thus limiting the attribution of metaphysical knowledge. Similar prudence is shown in the alteration of "the epistle of St. James" to "the epistle attributed to St. James"⁸⁷.

Two minor modifications of style invite comment. The

83. *Literature and Dogma*, (edition of 1874), p. 240. — 84. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), p. 254. — 85. *Id.*, p. 258. — 86. *Id.*, p. 265. — 87. *Id.*, p. 269.

almost unbelievable awkwardness of "in fineness or richness of spiritual perception his Epistle may be inferior to that of others" is remedied by the reduction of "to that of others" to "to other Epistles"⁸⁸; and the tincture of the ludicrous in the phrase "Christians vied with each other which could run fastest to the place of execution" disappears with the replacement of "could" by "should"⁸⁹.

The changes in the ninth chapter *Aberglaube Re-invading* are less interesting. A parallelism of structure — in this instance of rather artificial character — is achieved by the change of "to have been able to preserve the main lines of his teaching, and his way of using words" to "to have been able to preserve the main lines of his teaching, to preserve his way of using words"⁹⁰. The awkward "extractors of the true sense of the Bible", a phrase used in successive sentences and thus calling attention to itself, is happily replaced by the more normal "interpreters of the true sense of the Bible"⁹¹. In previous editions Arnold had said: "Plain and precise enough it is, in all conscience; with the advantage of being precisely *right*, whereas the plain dogma of our formularies is precisely *wrong*"⁹². The second "plain" represented another awkward effort at parallelism: its suppression in the fifth edition is a gain in clearness and ease. A more interesting modification occurs in the following phrase, here given as it read prior to the fourth edition: "not Augustine, Luther, Bossuet, Butler, but the nameless author of the *Imitation*, Tauler, St. Francis of Sales, Wilson of Sodor and Man." In the fourth edition the second half of the phrase has an "or" before each of the names; and in the fifth the "or" is replaced by "but"⁹³ except before "Wilson". The "or" was a palpable mistake since the preceding phrase runs in all editions: "And they, not the theological doctors, are the true lights of the Christian Church": a phrase which requires a plural sequent. The "but" not only is free of this objection to the "or"; by its emphatic power it improves upon the original form of the phrase.

88. *Literature and Dogma*, (Works, vol. VII), p. 270. — 89. *Id.*, p. 275. — 90. *Id.*, p. 284. — 91. *Id.*, p. 287. — 92. *Id.*, p. 291. — 93. *Id.*, p. 292.

The changes in chapter ten *Our 'Masses' and the Bible*, do not require comment.

In chapter eleven *The True Greatness of the Old Testament* significant changes are few. It is interesting to note the trifling additions by which Arnold communicates to an undistinguished sentence his rounded grace. In previous editions it had been : " It is not enough perceived what it is which gives France her attractiveness for everybody, her success, her repeated disasters. " In the fifth edition this runs : " It is not enough perceived what it is which gives to France her attractiveness for everybody, and her success and her repeated disasters ⁹⁴. " " Escape these " [difficulties] becomes more emphatic in the form " escape from these " ⁹⁵. A reference to miracles as " supernatural inventions " is modified to read " preternatural inventions " ⁹⁶ : the substituted adjective more accurately conveys Arnold's attitude towards the miraculous. A personal reference to Archdeacon Denison ⁹⁷ is suppressed as references to the unfortunate Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester are in the main throughout the book.

The last chapter *The True Greatness of Christianity* and the brief *Conclusion* will be considered together. Where Arnold had written of Christianity " its grandeur and truth are far most brought out *experimentally* " — an awkward and unidiomatic use of " most " he now has " far best brought out *experimentally* " ⁹⁸. A change made in the fourth edition in the interest of clarity and emphasis is now carried through the succeeding sentence. The colloquial " thorough inaptitude for ideas " is superseded by the appropriate " complete inaptitude for ideas " ⁹⁹. A more interesting change occurs in the phrase " a reality of which we can slowly trace the laws " ; this now becomes " a reality of which we can gradually though very slowly trace the laws " ¹⁰⁰. In its revised form the stress in the sentence is no longer upon the disheartening " slowly " but upon the " trace ", upon the

⁹⁴. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), p. 358. — ⁹⁵. *Id.*, p. 350. —

⁹⁶. *Id.*, p. 340. — ⁹⁷. *Literature and Dogma*, (edition of 1874), p. 344. —

⁹⁸. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), p. 366. — ⁹⁹. *Id.*, p. 372. —

¹⁰⁰. *Id.*, p. 374.

successful process. Three small modifications improve the last two sentences of the chapter. Previously these had run : " We end, therefore, as we began. For the whole series of experiences, of which the survey is thus completed, rests, primarily, upon one fundamental fact, — itself, also, a fact of experience : *the necessity of righteousness*. The revision reads : " We end therefore as we began, by experience. And the whole series of experiences, of which the survey is thus completed, rests, primarily, upon one fundamental fact — itself, eminently, a fact of experience : *the necessity of righteousness* " ¹⁰¹. The phrase " by experience " added to the first sentence lends to it quite conclusive force. The " for " was a rather doubtful connective : the relation to which it pointed was one neither easy nor important to apprehend. The adverb " eminently " inserted in place of " also " takes its place in the succession of " primarily ", and " fundamental " and ensures that the climax come at the close of the sentence.

In the *Conclusion* attention must be called to one curious error. In previous editions a sentence had run : " Of our hymns we here say nothing ". In the fifth edition this is replaced by " Of our hymns we shall say a word presently " ¹⁰²; but the promised " word " is not said. In the popular edition the sentence was omitted. No other change requires mention.

Of the thirty pages to which in the standard edition the preface extends, nineteen are omitted from the popular edition. Seventeen of these suppressed pages are in one solid block : these are the pages devoted to the admirable consideration of the role of culture in the use of the Bible and in religious criticism generally. The passage begins " Much fruit may be got out of the Bible... " and ends " Difficult, however, as culture is, it is necessary " ¹⁰³. With this passage we may take the page-long preparatory paragraph which almost immediately precedes it : " For, on the one hand, he has not enough experience... will insist on seeing them ready made, and in such precise and reduced

101. *Literature and Dogma*, (Works, vol. VII), p. 383. — 102. *Id.*, p. 386.
— 103. *Id.*, pp. xiv-xxix.

dimensions as may suit his narrow mind" ¹⁰⁴. Arnold's specific ground for excising these pages must have been a perception that vital as they are to the full force of his argument, nevertheless to a large popular audience they would seem discursive and superfluous. Only two other phrases are suppressed : and they are inconsequential.

Modifications of expression are comparatively few. Where, speaking of " an inevitable revolution " in religion he had said " no one is on that account in the least dispensed from the utmost duty of considerateness and caution ", he now says " In regard to it, however, there is incumbent on every one the utmost duty of considerateness and caution " ¹⁰⁵. The positive form is markedly more emphatic and more solemn. Rhetorical emphasis is strengthened when the phrase " to find for the Bible a basis " is expanded to " to find for the Bible, for Christianity, for our religion, a basis " ¹⁰⁶. I can see, on the other hand, merely a lack of tact in the substitution for " the people " of " the masses " ¹⁰⁷. The only other change to claim mention is the recognition of Newman's cardinalate : here and throughout the text, the popular edition has " Cardinal " where previous editions had " Dr. " Newman ¹⁰⁸.

The space gained by the suppressions above mentioned enabled Arnold to preface to his preface what he styles " Preface to this edition ", a completely new element, and excellently adapted to its function.

The *Introduction* (which is now the third part of the work) underwent no considerable change. Disraeli's peerage is recognized ; and here as throughout the text " Mr. Disraeli " is superseded by " Lord Beaconsfield " ¹⁰⁹.

From the first chapter *Religion Given* there were no suppressions and the additions, if not very numerous, are of unusual interest.

Doubtless it was the studies undertaken in preparation for *God and the Bible* which rendered Arnold more cautious in his use of a philological conjecture. Where in earlier edi-

¹⁰⁴. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), pp. XIII-XIV. ¹⁰⁵. — *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. XIII. — ¹⁰⁶. *Id.*, p. XVII. — ¹⁰⁷. *Id.*, p. XIX. — ¹⁰⁸. *Id.*, p. XV. — ¹⁰⁹. *Id.*, e. g. pp. 4-2.

tions he had written " we now learn from the philologists ", he now contents himself with " as some philologists tell us "; and in the following sentence where he had used the boldly affirmative " is ", he now writes " would be, (if the etymology is right) " ¹¹⁰. Another word of qualification " perhaps " is introduced in the same connection in a subsequent passage ¹¹¹. Accuracy is served by the substitution for the phrase " In Israel's earliest history and earliest literature " of " In Israel's earliest history and earliest utterances " ¹¹². Where he had asserted that the " generality of men " seek to reach the perfected sources of being " only " in the sphere of conduct, he now — wisely in a popular edition — substitutes for " only ", " almost solely " ¹¹³.

A highly important change in expression occurs in one of the most celebrated of Arnoldian formulae. In all previous editions one of the suggestive definitions of God was " *the stream of tendency by which all things fulfil the law of their being* " ; this is now rendered more dynamic and dramatic by the expansion of " fulfil " to " seek to fulfil " ¹¹⁴.

Modifications introduced in the second and third chapters may be considered together : they are very few. We may begin with two which are of dubious value. In previous editions a passage had run : " The very substitution of the word *Eternal* for the word *Lord* is something gained in this direction. The word *Eternal* has less of particularity and palpability for the imagination, but what it does affirm is real and verifiable. " In the present edition the final phrase is altered to " is something real and verifiable " ¹¹⁵. Patently Arnold was seeking a repetitive effect ; but the word " something " has not the same reference in the two cases ; and hence its repetition is disturbing rather than effective. The other questionable change is one of word-order. Where Arnold had written " if we read the Bible to find from it what those who wrote it really intended to think and say " he now has " if we read the Bible to find from it what really those who wrote it intended to think and say " ¹¹⁶. The order

¹¹⁰. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 10. — ¹¹¹. *Id.*, p. 22. — ¹¹². *Id.*, pp. 23-24. — ¹¹³. *Id.*, p. 33. — ¹¹⁴. *Id.*, p. 31. — ¹¹⁵. *Id.*, p. 47. — ¹¹⁶. *Id.*, p. 60.

in the second version is quite unnatural; and again one's judgment is that the change is disturbing rather than effective. Another change, not so disputable as these, but a loss in vividness unlike Arnold's usual practice, is the substitution of "track" for "tack" in the phrase "when his nation was on another and a false tack" ¹¹⁷. In the same way the change of the expression "these two words 'sweet reasonableness'" to "the phrase 'sweet reasonableness'" is a substitution of the more general for the more specific a loss in concreteness, — and a loss in emphasis as well ¹¹⁸. No gain is perceptible in the replacement of "witnesses to" in the phrase "New Testament witnesses to the workings of this desire" by "evidence to prove" ¹¹⁹; and the verbal felicity of the phrase "witnesses to the workings" is sacrificed.

A passage of about two pages was suppressed from the fourth section of the third chapter: a passage extending from the words "that the operation, professed and actual" to "in *conscience* being made the test" ¹²⁰. The first half of the passage is recapitulation; the second half leisurely preparation for what immediately follows. The suppression of the passage is to be ascribed not to a feeling that it would irk a popular audience but to a recognition that if the text was to be condensed, here was a passage whose removal would be innocuous to the argument.

One slight modification of meaning claims attention. The word "perhaps" was removed from the following sentence: "And indeed, the rendering of the final words, '*in his name shall the Gentiles trust,*' which is in the Greek of the Septuagint as well as in that of St. Matthew, shows, perhaps, a similar leaning in the Jews of Alexandria two centuries before Christ" ¹²¹.

In the fourth chapter, *The Proof from Prophecy*, there is no change of enough moment to deserve attention.

The modifications of the fifth chapter, *The Proof from Miracles*, are few and, with one exception, brief: but they offer some interest. M. Emile Burnouf who had in previous

¹¹⁷. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 61. — ¹¹⁸. *Id.*, p. 66. —
— ¹¹⁹. *Id.*, p. 71. — ¹²⁰. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), pp. 99-101.
— ¹²¹. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 72.

editions been styled "the accomplished son of a gifted father" is now, less precisely but more correctly, described as "the accomplished kinsman of the gifted orientalist Eugène Burnouf"¹²². He was a cousin of Eugène Burnouf; Arnold's error may perhaps be ascribed to the circumstance that Eugène Burnouf was twenty years the senior of Emile and died in 1852 in early middle age, while Emile Burnouf was still alive at the time when *Literature and Dogma* was written. There is an interesting improvement in the sentence which had run: "To what extent, or in how many cases, what is called *illness* is due to moral springs having been used amiss, — whether by being over-used or by not being used sufficiently, — we hardly at all know and we too little inquire". The expansion of the final phrase to "far too little inquire" is a gain both in balance and in emphasis¹²³.

The first half of the paragraph which in previous editions had begun with the words, "But suppose that the Bible itself put forth..."¹²⁴ was completely recast. The first two sentences, which express an imaginary contingency, were suppressed. The third sentence was completely rewritten and in the process expanded. The fourth sentence was slightly modified and with the fifth sentence a new paragraph now opens¹²⁵. The changes do not lend themselves to comment beyond the remark that by them greater emphasis is achieved.

In the sixth chapter, *The New Testament Record*, there is but one significant change: but it is of the greatest interest — the suppression of the third and fourth sections. These sections which, in the fifth edition, occupied about fifteen pages, are illustrative and controversial. For a popular audience they were unsuitable: such an audience would be perplexed by them, delayed, and probably diverted temporarily both from the main line of argument and the main cultural aim of *Literature and Dogma*. Their omission in no way weakens the demonstration of the main thought of the chapter: the incomparable superiority of Jesus to the New

¹²². *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 88. — ¹²³. *Id.*, p. 106. — ¹²⁴. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), p. 135. — ¹²⁵. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 101.

Testament writers and the legitimacy of ascribing to them the thaumaturgy and materialism; to Him the essential spirit and the moral value of the writings.

The length of the seventh chapter *The Testimony of Jesus to Himself* prompted a change in the popular edition. The chapter which in it bears the title just mentioned ends at what in previous editions had been the end of the fifth section. What followed forms a new chapter entitled *Faith in Christ*. The whole will here be considered as a unit. Much the most important of the modifications made for the popular edition are the omissions. The first section has been suppressed in full : its polemical and discursive character marked it out for this. The second section was similarly treated : parts of it would have been valuable to a popular audience but its core is a deprecation of the apocalyptic and phantasmagoric aspects of Daniel and Enoch, not irrelevant indeed but still not central to the argument, and above all, merely prefatory. The chapter opens with what had been its third section of which the first paragraph, a paragraph of recapitulation, is also omitted. The advantage of the changes is patent when one reads what is in the popular edition the first paragraph of the chapter. All the prolegomena have been removed; and Arnold begins *in medias res*. The latter half of the old third section is also omitted; the suppression of the pages from " keep judgment and do righteousness " ¹²⁶ is in some respects unfortunate. It is true that a considerable part of the suppressed passage has to do with the inadequate Jewish conception of righteousness which is here set in contrast with Christ's adequate conception; and it is true that for the free comprehension of another part some knowledge of the Greek sense of certain moral and spiritual terms is necessary; still there is no really irrelevant passage in these pages and much of them is important for the full expression of Arnold's thought. The fourth and fifth sections were not abbreviated.

Even more drastic was the abridgment of the second

¹²⁶. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), pp. 195-200.

half of the chapter; of five sections, three — the seventh, eighth and ninth — were entirely suppressed, and one of the remaining ones cut to half of its length. The seventh section deals, with an admirable range of felicitous illustration, with proper and improper conceptions of the relation of faith to reason. The eighth section, a brief passage, sharpens the previously emphasized contrast between the religious expressions of the New Testament and the theological formulations of modern churchmen and of the luckless bishops in especial. The ninth section, to which the eighth is a preface, considers two instances of the contrast, — the doctrine of atonement and the doctrine of the resurrection. The suppression of these sections is to be ascribed primarily, I suggest, to the need for condensation: the material they present is not of a kind to perplex, let alone to overtax a popular audience. Definitely regrettable is the suppression of the first five pages of the sixth section¹²⁷: in them Arnold had traced with admirable vigour and lucidity the varied prophecies of a Redeemer which are to be found in the Old Testament. Their suppression entailed that of the subsequent passage beginning "Thus, we say, his disciples and Christendom after them..." and ending at the close of the paragraph "his future advent"¹²⁸. The tenth and final section, which is very short, was left intact.

The minor modifications are of little interest. At the beginning of what had been the third section there is an effective recasting of a sentence. It had run: "Israel's old, sure proof of being in the right way, — the sanction of joy and peace, — was plainly wanting; and this was a test which anybody could at once apply." This now becomes: "Israel's old, sure proof of being in the right way, his test which anybody could at once apply — the sanction of joy and peace, — was plainly wanting"¹²⁹. The improvement is evident: the earlier version required either the repetition of "proof" in place of "test", and an accompanying change of verb — or else a more extensive modification such as that actually made. Less easy to explain is the

127. *Literature and Dogma*, (Works. vol. VII), pp. 216-221. — 128. *Id.*, p. 225. — 129. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 124.

substitution for " an intellectual theory of the divine nature and the system of things, which was then, and is still at present, utterly irreducible to experience " of " externally it seems, at any rate, to deliver with the forms of science, a theosophy not controllable by experience " ¹³⁰. The subject under consideration is the Fourth Gospel. The later form accomplishes two distinct ends, either of which could have been separately accomplished. The first — and it calls for no comment — is the limitation of the affirmation by the three expressions of caution " externally ", " seems ", and " at any rate ". The second is the heightening of expression by the inclusion of the term " theosophy " which, it should be noted, occurs in the preceding sentence. By virtue of his revision, Arnold is able to make an affirmation which is stronger, but at the same time to guard it more securely.

What in previous editions had been the eighth chapter *The Early Witnesses* was omitted from the popular edition. This chapter is of secondary importance : it merely seeks to reveal reflections of the temper and " secret " of Jesus in the New Testament writers. If abridgment of the book was necessary, no chapter could so properly be sacrificed.

The suppression of this chapter entailed that of the first paragraph — a junctive passage — of the following chapter *Aberglaube Re-invading*. In the revision of this chapter for the popular edition Arnold made what is incomparably the best-known of all his textual modifications. In the preface written for this edition he remarks :

The sole notion of *Literature and Dogma*, with many people is that it is a book containing an abominable illustration, and attacking Christianity. It may be regretted that an illustration likely to be torn from its context, to be improperly used, and to give pain should ever have been adopted. But it was not employed aggressively or bitterly ; on the contrary, it was part of a plea for treating popular religion with gentleness and indulgence. Many of those who have most violently protested against the illustration resent it, no doubt, because it directs attention to that extreme licence of affirmation about God which prevails in our popular religion ; and one is not the easier forgiven for directing attention to an error because one marks it as an object for indul-

130. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 135.

gence. To protesters of this sort, I owe no deference and make no concessions. But the illustration has given pain, I am told, in a quarter where my deference, and the deference of all who can appreciate one of the purest careers and noblest characters of our time, is indeed due; and finding that in that quarter pain has been given by the illustration, I do not hesitate to expunge it.

The illustration, then, disappears¹³¹...

The skilfulness of this is but little less remarkable than that revealed in the preface of *God and the Bible* in the passage in which Arnold writing after Wilberforce's death defends his animadversions upon him. Lord Shaftesbury's name is no longer to appear: and by a refinement of deference it does not appear even in the apology. And if it is not to appear, Arnold wishes to make clear to his readers, especially perhaps to his readers among the masses, that its suppression is entirely an act of deference to the great and good man, in no degree an act of prudence before the blasts of the pulpit and the ecclesiastical press,

The name of Lord Shaftesbury had occurred four times in the text: it is replaced either by "supernatural man" or "supernatural person".

No passages were suppressed: the whole of this chapter is essential to the argument of the book.

A few minor modifications deserve mention. A passage which had run: "miracles, and the crowning miracles of the Resurrection and Ascension..." gains both in force and in smoothness when "above all" is inserted before "the crowning miracles"¹³². Similar in effect is the change in the following phrase "Nor did the Reformation and Protestantism much mend the work of these critics", to which after "did" Arnold adds "even"¹³³. As elsewhere, wherever the phrase "Dr. Newman" had been used "Cardinal" now supersedes "Dr.". The omission of the preceding chapter required in one passage the alteration of "as we have shown" to "in fact"¹³⁴.

One need not look beyond the title of the tenth chapter *Our 'Masses' and the Bible* to be certain that no omissions

131. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), pp. vi-vii. — 132. *Id.*, p. 149. — 133. *Id.*, p. 162. — 134. *Id.*, p. 154.

would be made from it in an edition destined for a popular audience. It is in this chapter that the decision to defer to Lord Shaftesbury involved Arnold in genuine difficulty. Where with utter simplicity he had said "the difficulty is with the elder Lord Shaftesbury" he is now able to achieve nothing better than the cumbersome "the difficulty is with the infinitely magnified man who is the first of the three supernatural persons of our story"¹³⁵. Where he had alluded in passing to "[like] the story of the three Lord Shaftesburys" he must now laboriously explain "[like] a future life with rewards and punishments, or like the doctrine of the Trinity"¹³⁶. Six other mentions of Lord Shaftesbury were dealt with as in the preceding chapter.

Some minor modifications will be mentioned. Replacing "sure" by "surely"¹³⁷ he corrects the vulgar colloquialism of "you will find out your mistake, as sure as, if you disbelieve that fire burns and put your hand into the fire you will find out your mistake". A more interesting modification occurs in the penultimate sentence which had run: "And the great thing against any such thesis as either of the two we have just mentioned is, that the more we know of the history of the human spirit and its deliverances, the more we have reason to think such a thesis improbable, and it loses hold on our assent more and more"¹³⁸. In the wish for a rounded close Arnold had broken the parallelism of the structure by adding the last two words; in the popular editions they disappear. Negligence in following through with a revision is rare; but in this chapter an interesting example of it occurs. In the first sentence of a section Arnold expanded "we propose" to "which we propose"¹³⁹. Four sentences farther on in the same section the phrase in which these words occur is repeated but the change is not carried through.

One change of meaning is of high importance. Where Arnold, in a celebrated definition, had affirmed of conduct that it was "nearly the whole of human life", he now affirms

¹³⁵. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 177. — ¹³⁶. *Id.*, p. 179. — ¹³⁷. *Id.*, p. 185. — ¹³⁸. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), pp. 338-339. — ¹³⁹. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 191.

merely that it is "the main part of human life" ¹⁴⁰. None of his hyperboles more instantly required alteration.

The modifications undergone by the text of the eleventh chapter *The True Greatness of the Old Testament* affect only single words and brief phrases. Two more allusions to Lord Shaftesbury are removed. How it weakens the effect where in the sentence: "But the truth is, that one may have a great respect for Lord Shaftesbury, and yet be permitted, even however much he may be magnified, to imagine something far beyond him", the specific "Lord Shaftesbury" is generalized to "man" ¹⁴¹. Another regrettable modification, undertaken, I conjecture, out of fear that the irony would escape the "masses", is in the insertion after "know" in the following sentence of "according to their own statements": "they do themselves signal injustice: they themselves know a great deal, far too much" ¹⁴².

The most interesting change in the chapter occurs in the sentence which had previously run: "Down they come one after another; Assyria falls, Babylon, Greece, Rome" ¹⁴³. "Greece" is now suppressed, although in a subsequent sentence "Judea itself, the Holy Land, the land of God's Israel" is affirmed also to have perished, and for the same cause, a defect of righteousness. In a subsequent section Greece and France are said (and were so said in earlier editions) to have been the victims of a defect of righteousness. I suggest that the omission of Greece from the sentence under consideration was due to an artist's unwillingness to anticipate a fine effect. In the following sentence: "The world goes on, nations and men arrive and depart, with varying fortunes, as it appears, with time and chance happening unto all", the substitution of "might seem" for "appears" ¹⁴⁴ shelters the writer from the charge of misinterpreting his author — in this case Davison of Oriel, Newman's Davison — and forcing a gratuitously fatalistic emphasis upon his thought.

All the significant changes in the twelfth chapter *The True Greatness of Christianity* hinge upon the insertion in phrases

140. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 188. — 141. *Id.*, p. 202. — 142. *Id.*, loc. cit. — 143. *Literature and Dogma*, (*Works*, vol. VII), p. 351. — 144. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 204.

relating to Christ of the word "temper". Where at the close of the first paragraph Arnold had spoken of "his *method* and his *secret*" he now speaks of "his *method* and his *secret* in union with his *temper*"¹⁴⁶. Similar changes occur in six other phrases in the chapter. The modification is a happy one, coming as it does in the last chapter of the book: by means of it Arnold is able to impress yet more powerfully upon the reader the full nature of Christ's value to the world, a three-fold value, the value of a method, of a secret, of a temper. Of considerable rhetorical worth is a modification of "that this is the righteousness which is saving, and that there is none other" to "that this is the righteousness which is saving and that none other saves"¹⁴⁶. Another allusion to Lord Shaftesbury is removed.

In the *Conclusion* references to "literature" become, perhaps with a reminiscence of the Rede lecture, references to "literature and science", and references to science become references to "art and science" or "science and art"¹⁴⁷. One change was made in the triumphantly ironic close. A sentence had run: "For while they were born with talents for metaphysical speculation and abstruse reasoning, we are so notoriously deficient in everything of that kind, that our adversaries taunt us with it and have held us up to public ridicule..." The sentence has but one flaw — the "it" the logical antecedent of which is a whole phrase. This flaw Arnold removes by substituting for "it" "our weakness"¹⁴⁸.

¹⁴⁵. *Literature and Dogma*, (popular edition), p. 212. — ¹⁴⁶. *Id.*, p. 221. — ¹⁴⁷. *Id.*, pp. 229-230. — ¹⁴⁸. *Id.*, p. 231.

CHAPTER VII

GOD AND THE BIBLE

Of *God and the Bible*, a sequel to *Literature and Dogma*, there are three distinct texts, namely (1) the text of seven papers contributed to *The Contemporary Review* under the formidable title of *A Review of Objections to Literature and Dogma*, — papers which appeared in the issues of October and November, 1874, January, March, May, July and September, 1875, (2) the text of the standard edition in book-form published in 1875 and not reprinted in the life-time of the author, and (3) the text of the popular “condensed” edition of 1884.

Let us first examine the novelties introduced in the standard edition. A preface of fifty pages was written for this edition, the consideration of which we may defer to the moment when we take up its modifications in the popular edition. Suppressions from the text of the periodical articles were few, but among them it is necessary to note an urbane passage upon the criteria of public combat with private acquaintances :

Private considerations are not, in general, matter with which to trouble the public, but where they come in to fix a rule for literary conduct they may be mentioned. Personal acquaintance, if it is at all friendly or intimate, excludes in my opinion the right of public ridicule and attack. For many years I have been on terms of at least friendly acquaintance with the Archbishop of York ; to say in print what was offensive to him I should think as inexcusable as to say it in his company. I believe that I have in my book said nothing of him that can be offensive¹.

¹ 1. *Contemporary Review*, vol. XXIV, p. 803.

Complementary with this suppression were the two following :

My personal acquaintance with the late Bishop of Winchester was of that very slight kind which imposes no restraint upon public criticism².

With the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, I had when *Literature and Dogma* was published, no personal acquaintance whatever³.

Were these passages suppressed because Matthew Arnold had ceased to subscribe to the principle which they define and follow ? It is certain that even in his later years he wrote of Gladstone with a licence of irony which must have given pain; and yet his acquaintance with Gladstone was not " of that very slight kind which imposes no restraint upon public criticism. " Disraeli he knew and liked much better, but of Disraeli also he allowed himself to write what it would have been " inexcusable " to have said " in his company. " Or were these passages suppressed as improper for publication, unbecoming to the dignity of an introduction ? I incline to the former explanation of their suppression, despite the inconsistency to which it points.

Another suppression is this, the introduction to the third paper, but a substantive passage :

Conjectures are dangerous things, but they form themselves and visit us whether one will or no. And we cannot help entertaining the conjecture that the criticism upon *Literature and Dogma* in the *Westminster Review* was written by the author of *Supernatural Religion*. At any rate the character which marks both the criticism in the *Review* and that in *Supernatural Religion* is the same, a mechanical character⁴.

In the third paragraph of the fourth paper Matthew Arnold acknowledged Mr. Cassels' disclaimer of the review in the *Westminster*⁵. In revision he was naturally persuaded to suppress this and similar passages which now had no function.

The complete history of a gradual suppression may be

2. *Contemporary Review*, vol. XXIV, *loc. cit.* — 3. *Id.*, p. 804. — 4. *Contemporary Review*, vol. XXV, p. 279. — 5. *Id.*, p. 500.

given here. In the first version a sentence stood thus : " Now these ideas have such a range that they take in at least three-fourths of human life ; or, if Mr. Gladstone pleases (and perhaps it really does add a little dignity to the thing) let us say seventy-five per cent⁶. " In the second version, Matthew Arnold, appreciating perhaps the cheapening effect of the jest upon what was intended as an emphatic conclusion of an eloquent flight, suppressed the second part of the sentence⁷. In the third version, Matthew Arnold, appreciating almost certainly the anticlimactic quality of this concluding sentence, as it survived, suppressed what he had allowed to stand in the second. A passage to the discredit of the mechanical criticism of Baur and irrelevant to the specific purpose of the section in which it appeared was transferred to a suitable context and in minor aspects revised.

More interesting is the suppression of the conclusion of the fourth paper, in which Matthew Arnold consoles the reader with an assurance that the destructive criticism to which the first four papers had been reluctantly devoted — the objections to *Literature and Dogma* involved Arnold in this uncongenial work — will shortly be succeeded by conservative criticism :

With what joy shall we release him... from a kind of disquisition always trying to get itself rated above its real importance and to interest us beyond our real needs. ' Don't go too far in your books and overgrasp yourself. Alas you have no time left to peruse your diary, to read over the Greek and Roman History ; come, don't flatter and deceive yourself ; look to the main chance, to the end and design of reading, and mind life more than notion. I say if you have a kindness for your person, drive at the practice and help yourself for that is in your own power.' What would Marcus Aurelius have said if he could have seen the list of references in *Supernatural Religion* ?⁸.

The importance of the quotation and the spirited comment which follows it, is incalculable ; there are few sentences so revelatory of the critical method of Arnold, few so important for the intellectual history of Arnold. His *universalitas*,

6. *Contemporary Review*, vol. XXV, p. 288. — 7. *God and the Bible*, (edition of 1875), p. 430. — 8. *Contemporary Review*, vol. XXV, p. 526.

his objection to any partial ideal, any ideal which would tend to the subordination of a human being's life to any aspect or complex of aspects of his activity, is the source of what is excellent, as of what is deficient, in his criticism. Possibly Arnold was not reluctant to suppress a passage which was a mere "give-away". It is more likely however that the passage disappeared merely as a concluding flourish often disappears in Arnold's revisions, when its conclusive function has become obsolete.

Other suppressions do not require mention. Among the additions are the great bulk of the references to Biblical texts and other sources and a limited number of more extended footnotes, the most interesting of which concludes with a shaft at science :

Pilate catches at the word *truth*, takes it (as if he had been a member of the British Association) in the sense of universal knowledge; drops the article, and asks his disconsolate question : "What is truth ?"⁹.

Other additions, except one brief comparison of Catholic and Semitic materialism in theology, are merely junctive or expansive and do not invite mention or comment.

Among the incidental modifications and especially among the substitutions, few in number, some require comment. A strange negligence in describing Zachariah's affliction as "blindness" was rectified and "dumbness" takes its place¹⁰; the status of "Mr." Mozley rises to "Dr." Mozley¹¹; the rare form "gradation" is normalized to "graduation"¹²; "current theology" and "official theology", neither of which suggests obliquity, give way to "Established theology"¹³ with its aroma of fading formulae.

The modifications introduced into the text of 1884 require classification. Writing in the October of that year to his American friend C. E. Norton, Arnold allowed himself to admit : "In preparing it [*God and the Bible*] for the press I seem to find some chapters in it to be the best prose I have ever succeeded in writing"¹⁴. " In the *Preface* written for the

9. *God and the Bible*, (edition of 1875), p. 40. — 10. *Id.*, p. 48. — 11. *Id.*, p. 41. — 12. *Id.*, p. 281. — 13. *Id.*, p. 3. — 14. *Letters*, (ed. Russell), vol. II, p. 263.

edition of 1884, Arnold describes this edition as "meant to reproduce, in a somewhat condensed and much cheaper form, a work, *God and the Bible*, which the objections to *Literature and Dogma* called forth"¹⁵. These two announcements dispose us to expect a significant number of condensations and few modifications of other origin.

Let us examine first the condensations. Of the *Preface* very little was sacrificed : the equivalent of about three brief paragraphs from its body¹⁶ — technical expansions of the argument, for the most part — and the entire exordium of six pages, a tribute to German criticism compensatory for the depreciation and denigration which it had suffered in the later chapters of the work¹⁷. The suppression of these pages was probably adaptative : a popular audience would not be allured to the perusal of a work which opened with the name of Baur and referred to the theories of the Tübingen school as commonplaces of knowledge, and, which was worse, quoted German writers in their own idiom.

Of the *Introduction*, almost the whole of the first section disappeared : this section dealt chiefly, and in a supercilious manner, with the popular function of *Literature and Dogma*¹⁸; its suppression, therefore, was an example of literary tact. Most of the second section was also sacrificed¹⁹ : its theme was the opposite methods of criticism practised by Dr. Colenso and Mr. Cassels. This, too, according to Matthew Arnold's opinion, would have been an improper subject for popular meditation. The third and final section was suppressed *en bloc*²⁰ : it dealt with the notorious and scandalous "parable" of the three Lord Shaftesburys, suppressed from the popular edition of *Literature and Dogma*, published in the preceding year, and the explanation of the author's relations with individual members of the bench of Bishops completed by a derogatory opinion of its vivid opponent, F. D. Maurice. The former part of the section was suppressed, as a matter of course : the latter, little likely to interest, much less concern, a

15. *God and the Bible*, (popular edition), p. vii. — 16. *God and the Bible*, (edition of 1875), pp. xi-xiv. — 17. *Id.*, pp. v-x. — 18. *Id.*, p. 3, pp. 5-9. — 19. *Id.*, p. 10, pp. 10-16. — 20. *Id.*, pp. 18-25.

popular audience, was a natural subject for "condensation". The *Introduction* of 1875 had extended through twenty-five pages; the *Introduction* of 1884 took just over four.

The embroideries of an introduction are easier to remove than the vital organs of the book. From the first chapter, of thirty-five pages, only three were suppressed. These pages were built upon a comparison of a contemporary event distorted by numerous inadequate reporters with a Biblical event similarly distorted. This was an attractive, a persuasive passage, but a passage with no demonstrative function²¹.

The suppressions from the second chapter of fifty-two pages were proportionate with that from the first. A passage of just over two pages, meeting a secondary but revelatory objection, was justifiably suppressed²². Another, of just under two pages, the summary of a section, added nothing new and thus invited condensation²³. Other excisions were insignificant.

The third chapter, in which the principal objectors to *Literature and Dogma* were impaled upon the lance of Arnold's dialectic, remained almost untouched. The paragraph summarizing the fourth section and a chain of sentences upon the Unitarians was sacrificed, about a page in all²⁴. The latter sacrifice, inconsiderable as condensation, was perhaps — it would have touched the heart of A. W. Benn to believe so — inspired by the kindlier feeling to the Unitarian body, aroused by Arnold's reception in New England.

The fourth chapter, a chapter of facts, sixty-five pages in length, was not amenable to condensation. Three passages, aggregating just over three pages and dealing with Cassels' work *Supernatural Religion*, disappeared²⁵. Matthew Arnold erased all references to Cassels' work in his popular editions. A pleasing page upon the wisdom of limiting studies which promise little, comparable in temper with the passage quoted from Marcus Aurelius and examined above, was jus-

21. *God and the Bible*, (edition of 1875), pp. 46-49. — 22. *Id.*, pp. 85-87. — 23. *Id.*, pp. 90-99. — 24. *Id.*, pp. 135-136, pp. 155-156. — 25. *Id.*, pp. 163-164., pp. 166-167, pp. 214-215.

tifiably sacrificed²⁶. Other suppressions were unimportant.

From the fifth chapter, fifty-four pages in length, sixteen pages were excised, almost a third. The chief suppression was of a passage of eleven consecutive pages, the exordium, a crucifixion of the mechanical method of German criticism, and one of Matthew Arnold's best flights in critical theory, addressed to a competent, rather than to a popular audience²⁷. Another passage of almost three pages arraigned the German critics for their provincial proclivity to scolding abuse and their mandarin judgments²⁸. Two further pages of technical criticism in carefully tailored language, where both the Tübingen school and their English neophyte the author of *Supernatural Religion* were involved, were also suppressed²⁹. Other suppressions were inconsiderable. Drastic as was the process of condensation applied in this chapter, it in no way violated the principles of revision illustrated in the remainder of the work.

From the sixth chapter of one hundred and one pages, the crux of the work, wherein Matthew Arnold expounded his personal theory of the mediacy of the New Testament record, just over six pages were suppressed. Two pages of interesting but somewhat fantastic consolation for the mediacy of the revelation were suppressed, probably as likely to bemuse rather than enlighten a popular audience³⁰. A specific illustration of a demonstration, extended through more than a page, was apt for condensation³¹. Two pages in which the argument depends upon the original of the New Testament were suppressed in conformity with an explicit promise that the perusal of Arnold's works in their popular editions would involve no knowledge of foreign languages³². Other suppressions were inconsiderable in length and in content.

From the conclusion, admirable in its prophetic scope and in its compact thought, there were no suppressions.

With the problematic exception of the allusion to the Unitarians the above suppressions are, I believe, purely

26. *God and the Bible*, (edition of 1875), pp. 173-174. — 27. *Id.*, pp. 216-217. — 28. *Id.*, pp. 229-232. — 29. *Id.*, pp. 256-258. — 30. *Id.*, pp. 324-326. — 31. *Id.*, pp. 326-328. — 32. *Id.*, pp. 329-331.

adaptative. This implies that although the popular edition has textual status, and although, in consequence, it is always permissible in a comparison of its text with the text of the standard edition, to ascribe the superiority to the text of the popular edition, this ascription should always be confined to a specific revision, and carries no presumption of continuous or intrinsic superiority.

Among the substitutions and other incidental modifications, a number appear to be merely adaptative and not corrective. In 1875 Arnold had written "Popular Christianity, drenched in the preternatural" ³³; in 1884 the latter part of the phrase disappeared. Was the motive of suppression, dissatisfaction with an approximation to the unscrupulous Corinthian style of Kinglake or Macaulay? Or deference to the audience of a popular edition? The major factor was probably the latter. In 1875 "Popular" theology "repels"; in 1884 it but "dissatisfies" ³⁴. Similarly to "reject the Bible testimony" takes the more healthy form of to "doubt the Bible testimony" ³⁵. A condemnation of Free-love becomes overweighted with zealous adjectives ³⁶. Simplicity is attained by some substitutions: « consciousness » gives place to "soul" ³⁷, and a too terse statement of metaphysical purport is elaborated into lucidity ³⁸. The following sentence with its implication that the desiderated audience was sparse: "if there are but ten people in the world who deal with religion fairly, he [i. e. the reader for whom "the work is meant"] is resolved to be one of those ten"; gives way to one where there is no chilling numerical reference ³⁹.

Other modifications merely comply with the passage of time: a period upon which "we are now entering" becomes one upon which "we have now entered" ⁴⁰; M. Adolphe Belot's novels rise from "forty and fifty editions" to "countless editions" ⁴¹ and are in 1884 coupled with "M. Zola's" ⁴², much more prominent than he had been in

33. *God and the Bible*, (edition of 1875), p. xiii. — 34. *God and the Bible*, (popular edition), p. 56. — 35. *Id.*, p. 100. — 36. *Id.*, p. 87. — 37. *Id.*, p. 66. — 38. *Id.*, p. 47. — 39. *God and the Bible*, (edition of 1875), p. xli. — 40. *God and the Bible*, (popular edition), p. xiii. — 41. *Id.*, p. xxvi. — 42. *Id.*, loc. cit.

1875; " Lord Lyttelton " becomes " the late Lord Lyttelton " ⁴³.

Strictly corrective modifications are almost exclusively stylistic and will be examined in another chapter of this work.

⁴³. *God and the Bible*, (popular edition), *Id.*, p. 10.

CHAPTER VIII

LAST ESSAYS ON CHURCH AND RELIGION

There are but two distinct texts of *Last Essays on Church and Religion*, — the text of the periodical articles and the text of the standard edition in book-form of 1877. The popular edition of 1903 is a page-for-page, word-for-word, reprint of the standard edition. This consists of (1) a preface written for this edition (2) *A Psychological Parallel*, which had appeared in *The Contemporary Review* for November, 1876, (3) two papers on *Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist*, which after their delivery as lectures to the Philosophical Institution at Edinburgh, had appeared in *The Contemporary Review* for February and March, 1876, (4) *The Church of England*, which after its delivery as "an address to the London clergy at Sion College," had appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for April, 1876, (5) *A Last Word on the Burials Bill*, which had appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for July, 1876. The volume is in no important sense unified; and, accordingly the essays reprinted from the periodicals will be examined singly; the preface, since it exists in but one text, does not concern us.

There were no suppressions from, or substantive additions to, the paper *A Psychological Parallel*. The most interesting modifications introduced into the text of this paper are alterations of a somewhat grudging attitude toward Principal Tulloch's study *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century*. "A good work" takes the cordial form "an excellent work"¹;

1. *Last Essays on Church and Religion*, (*Works*, vol. IX), p. 218.

"Far too much space" is reduced to „somewhat too much space" ²; "if Principal Tulloch would extract it and give it to us" is less brusquely put as "if Principal Tulloch would lay us under fresh obligations by himself extracting this and giving it to us" ³: there is equally marked deference in the rounding of "has given too much prominence" to "seems to me to have given too much prominence" ⁴.

The note of deference is also struck in an interpretation of John Smith's attitude to witchcraft: "accepted" becomes "seems to have accepted" ⁵, all that a perusal of Smith's *Discourses* will warrant. The product of the same mood of deference and caution, "almost everyone" becomes "almost every reader of the Bible" ⁶, and "no work of one generation, but of centuries" becomes "no work of one generation, but of centuries and centuries" ⁷. On the other hand where Mr. Frederic Harrison had been claimed merely "mistaken" he is in 1877 claimed to "err(s) at the very outset" ⁸. But the passage in which this forcible statement occurs is incidental and digressive.

In the text of 1876, an ambiguous reference to the Oath of Supremacy suggested its continued presence in the Ordination Service, and ended with the peculiar remark: "If the Oath of Supremacy is to be taken at all, it should be before the civil magistrate." In 1877, in the stead of this we have the clear statement: "the Oath of Supremacy has now no longer a place in the Ordination Service" ⁹. A superfluous sentence is suppressed and an ambiguous reference clarified.

The two papers on *Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist* will be examined as a unit. The modifications introduced into the text of these papers, if numerous, are not capital: as has already been pointed out the first published text of material which had already been delivered from the platform was rarely revised by Arnold in any very significant respect.

There is, however, an improvement in urbanity. The damaging assertion that an explanation "was necessitated

2. *Last Essays on Church and Religion*, (*Works*, vol. IX), *loc. cit.* — 3. *Id.*, p. 220. — 4. *Id.*, p. 219. — 5. *Id.*, p. 223. — 6. *Id.*, p. 246. — 7. *Id.*, p. 244. — 8. *Id.*, p. 237. — 9. *Id.*, p. 232.

by " the anticipatory theory is softened by the perhaps ironic " was well-suited to " ¹⁰ the given theory. The patronizing remark that men of his own time " were able to view miracles and prophecy more justly than Butler could " is improved in taste by a substitution of " did " for " could " ¹¹. What had been called in derision a proof is now accepted as a suggestion. Butler's psychology is in 1876 " mechanical ", a singularly infelicitous adjective since Butler was an explicit assailant of the mechanism of Hobbes; in 1877 it is merely " elaborate " just as it had appeared to Arnold thirty years before in his sonnet *Written in Butler's Sermons* ¹². Two corrections which otherwise would require extended comment, are, I believe, merely restorations of Arnold's manuscript text, the versions of 1876 being at these points, as at others, in typographical error ¹³.

A number of junctive sentences were added in 1877; but these are of merely rhetorical or stylistic value.

The modifications of the text of the remaining two papers do not require comment.

10. *Last Essays on Church and Religion*, (*Works*, vol. IX), p. 298. — 11. *Id.*, p. 329. — 12. *Id.*, p. 306. The relevant lines in the sonnet are:

Affections, Instincts, Principles and Powers,
Impulse and Reason, Freedom and Control
So men unravelling God's harmonious whole
Rend in a thousand shreds this life of ours.
Vain labour!

13. *Id.*, p. 294; "propensions" replaces "possessions" in the phrase "passions and possessions". The next sentence in both texts has "passions" and "propensions"; "this Christianity", an evident error in the context, becomes "true Christianity".

CHAPTER IX

MIXED ESSAYS

Or *Mixed Essays* there are but two distinct texts, namely the text of the component essays in the periodicals where they first appeared, and the text of the standard edition of 1879. Later editions, the second edition of 1880 and the popular edition of 1903, are page-for-page, word-for-word reprints of the edition of 1879. The contents of the edition in book-form of 1879 are (1) a brief preface composed for this edition (2) *Democracy*, a reprint with minor revisions of the introduction to the volume *Popular Education in France* which appeared in 1861, a work which, Arnold says in the preface to *Mixed Essays*, " has probably been read by specialists only, " ¹ (3) a garner of papers which during 1877 and 1878 had " appeared in well-known reviews " ².

Since Mr. Saintsbury gives an inexact account of the periodical publication of these essays it will be well to enumerate the issues and reviews in which they appeared : (1) *Equality*, in the *Fortnightly* for March 1878, (2) *Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism*, in the *Fortnightly* for July 1878, (3) *Porro Unum Est Necessarium*, in the *Fortnightly* for November, 1878, (4) *A Guide to English Literature* in *The Nineteenth Century*, for December, 1877, (5) *Falkland* in *The Nineteenth Century* for March, 1877, (6) *A French Critic on Milton* in *The Quarterly* for January, 1877, (7) *A French Critic on Goethe* in *The Quarterly* for

1, *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol. X), p. v. — 2. *Id.*, *loc. cit.*

January, 1878, (8) *George Sand* in the *Fortnightly* for June, 1877.

The collection *Mixed Essays*, possesses, as Matthew Arnold insists in his model preface, "a unity of tendency"³; but this does not imply any organic unity such as would justify an examination of the volume as an artistic unit, formal and material. The essays are better examined as they were composed, distinctly.

The paper on *Democracy* was eighteen years old before it was incorporated in this collection. It required and received significant revision. Perhaps the most interesting single modification was the rewriting of the following paragraph :

In all the remarks which I am making, I impose on myself the rule carefully to abstain from any attempt to suggest a positive application of them. I do not presume to discuss in what manner the world of facts is to adapt itself to the changed world of ideas which I have been describing. I offer general considerations, — presented, I hope, without offensiveness, as I am sure they have been formed without prejudice — considerations suggested by watching the course of men and classes in this country, to the silent reflection of thinking minds. This an isolated individual, however humble, may fairly attempt; more he cannot attempt properly; perhaps the time has not yet come for more to be attempted at all. But one breach of my rule I shall here venture to commit, by dwelling for a moment on a matter of practical institution, designed to meet new social exigencies : on the intervention of the State in public education⁴.

How badly written and how badly put together this paragraph is! How limp, how like Uriah Heep, that product as Earl Russell says "of lessons in humility at a Charity School", is its apologetic tone! How lame its would-be-decisive final sentence! Here is the paragraph recast for the volume of 1879 :

In all the remarks which I have been making, I have hitherto abstained from any attempt to suggest a positive application of them. I have limited myself to simply pointing out in how changed a world of ideas we are living; I have not sought to go fur-

3. *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol. X), *loc. cit.* — 4. *The Popular Education of France, with Notices of that of Holland and Switzerland*, pp. xxxviii-xxxix.

ther, and to discuss in what particular manner the world of facts is to adapt itself to this changed world of ideas. This has been my rule so far; but from this rule I shall here venture to depart, in order to dwell for a moment on a matter of practical institution, designed to meet new social exigencies : on the intervention of the State in public education⁵.

How well this is knit together, how virile the explanation of the deviation from a principle! Nothing is so impressive to the student of Arnold's text, as his steady growth in assurance and experience.

New assurance is manifested in several modifications of the text; in 1861 he had insinuated that certain aristocracies were "not precisely fitted to have the full direction", in 1879 the saving "precisely" disappears⁶; he had referred, in speaking of the masses, to "the highest pitch of welfare possible for them", but in 1879 he suppresses the slippery reservation implied in the word "possible"⁷; what the middle classes "desire" in 1861, in 1879 they "are entitled to desire"⁸; in 1861 he professes to "admire" them, the author of *Culture and Anarchy* and *Friendship's Garland* no more than "esteems" them⁹; "narrow and somewhat harsh" they deteriorate until they are "narrow, harsh, unintelligent"¹⁰.

It is necessary to notice another passage, comparing England and America and suppressed in 1879 :

In fact, unless a nation's action is inspired by an ideal commanding the respect of the many as higher than each ordinary man's own, there is nothing to keep that nation together, nothing to resist the dissolvent action of innumerable and conflicting wills and opinions. *Quot homines, tot sententiæ*, and one man's opinion is as good as another's : — there is no basis for a real unity here. In this regard what is now passing in the United States of America is full of instruction for us. I hear numberless English lamenting the disruption of the American Union; they esteem it a triumph for the enemies of all freedom, a discouragement for the principles of self-government as they have been long understood and put in practice in this country as well as in America. I, on the contrary, esteem it a great and timely lesson to the over-individualism of the English character. We in England

5. *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol. X), p. 31. — 6. *Id.*, p. 5. — 7. *Id.*, p. 6. — 8. *Id.*, p. 34. — 9. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 10. *Id.*, p. 38.

have had, in our great aristocratical and ecclesiastical institutions, a principle of cohesion and unity which the Americans had not; they gave the tone to the nation and the nation took it from them; self-government here was quite a different thing from self-government there¹¹.

This passage combining a forcible American reference with the Arnoldian doctrine of the duality of all ethical reality, would have been precisely to the taste of such American interpreters of Arnold as Stuart Sherman. Part of it had to be revised, in view of the emergence of the United States from the Civil War, and the antiquity of what had, in 1861, been a strictly up-to-the-minute illustration. One may regret that the scissors were not used more sparingly; that Arnold suppressed where he might have revised.

Other modifications do not require mention.

The textual status of the periodical paper on *Equality* is high; before its publication this paper had been read as a lecture at *The Royal Institution*. Perhaps it was as a lecture rather than a paper that Arnold regarded it; for in the following paper an allusion to "what I said in this *Review* in March" is modified to "what I said at the Royal Institution last February"¹². A negation of doubtful validity is introduced into a concise setting of the causes of the French Revolution in order of their relative importance. The version of 1878 is as follows: "It was not the spirit of philanthropy which mainly impelled the French to that Revolution, neither was it the spirit of envy; it was the spirit of society¹³." In 1879 this becomes: "It... envy, neither was it the love of abstract ideas though all these did something towards it: but what did most was the spirit of society¹⁴." One may, at least, admire the "spirit" of the concessive clause inserted in the formulation of such a drastic theory. The assertion that "general honesty and power of true work, *verus labor*" "prevail throughout the lower" class

11. *The Popular Education of France, with Notices of that of Holland and Switzerland*, p. xxxiii. — 12. *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol. X), p. 134. — 13. *Fortnightly Review*, (*New Series*), vol. XXV, p. 322. — 14. *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol. X), p. 67.

is very prudently reduced to the assertion that " honesty and power of true work, the *virtus verusque labor* " " are to be found in abundance throughout the lower " class¹⁵. The former mutilation of the Latin tag I am powerless to interpret. " We are most of us politicians " becomes more damning in the form " We are all of us politicians " ¹⁶. A sentence is added to stress the inadequacy of the English aristocracy to the aristocratic function of incarnating an admirable national ideal. This sentence balances another brief addition, the body of which is a reasonable generalization of his personal experience with the aristocracy : " Everything which succeeds they tend to welcome, to win over, to put on their side; genius may generally make, if it will, not bad terms for itself with them ¹⁷. "

Other modifications are insignificant.

The modifications of the text of *Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism* are of the same incidental character. An allusion to the continental conception of a denominational university is clarified by a passage Arnold, prompted perhaps by a French Protestant friend¹⁸, added on the Protestantism of " Strasburg " and the Catholicity of Bonn¹⁹. An Aristotelian sentence is added to complete an arraignment of the temporizing Liberal attitude to religious endowment²⁰. Another brick is hurled at the bucolic Catholicism of the Irish : in the former text it was " Ultramontane, priest-governed, superstitious; now as a final lapse, it is " self-confident " ²¹. An important and compact *Esto perpetua!* is added to Arnold's surprising long line of salutations to the Establishment²². Other modifications are incidental.

The paper *Porro Unum Est Necessarium*, mainly a paper of fact and quotation, underwent no capital modification. The second and third sentences of the present version, so disabused and so genuine in tone, are additions of 1879. And it is interesting to note that in two passages where Arnold claimed that English middle class education was the

15. *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol. X), p. 83. — 16. *Id.*, p. 91. — 17. *Id.*, p. 83. — 18. *Letters*, (ed. Russell), vol. II. p. 148. — 19. *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol X), p. 97. — 20. *Id.*, p. 108. — 21. *Id.*, p. 117. — 22. *Id.*, p. 130.

worst in that part of Europe, "civilised Europe" replaces "Western Europe" ²³. Arnold probably recalled that he had already pre-empted for the Irish that bad eminence.

The paper *A Guide to English Literature* has equally few modifications of importance. The two main modifications are merely cautious. Arnold had said that Shakespeare "abounds" in detestable writing; reflection reduces "abounds" to "is too frequent" ²⁴. A curious passage of Stopford Brooke's on Shelley's feeling for nature, singled out for criticism, had been pronounced "utterly out of place" ²⁵; the verdict is given an almost insignificant mitigation to "quite out of place". This revision was perhaps prompted by a wish to avoid an awkward succession of sounds.

The paper *Falkland* has but three significant modifications. One regrets the substitution for the lively parenthesis "Owen the dreariest of theologians and Baxter the king of bores", of the anodyne generalized phrase "the Owens and the Baxters" ²⁶. The former alternative merits housing in the very strictest anthology of English vituperation, a merit which probably excluded it from the present urbane essay, one of Arnold's mellowest works.

Two other modifications may, perhaps, be ascribed to a common preoccupation. In the paper *Equality*, Arnold made an extended allusion to Goldwin Smith's resentment of the "imputation upon that Puritan type of life" which had been the covert aim of the paper *Falkland*. Indeed, this paper, upon its periodical publication, finding its way into that arsenal of Puritanism and radicalism "The Grange", had roused the ever ready wrath of Goldwin Smith. From his transatlantic retirement in Toronto, he countered it in *The Contemporary Review* with the competence of a specialist in the perplexed history of the Commonwealth and the bitterness of a Puritan enthusiast. He assailed Arnold's reliance upon Clarendon as a disinterested witness to Falkland's intelligence. It was probably as a concession to the paper of Smith (later reprinted in his *Lectures and Essays*),

23. *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol. X), p. 146. — 24. *Id.*, p. 186. — 25. *Id.*, p. 196. — 26. *Id.*, p. 224.

that Arnold, in revision, admitted that Clarendon's praise of Falkland was "a little excessive" ²⁷ and from claiming that in his *Life* Clarendon's "touch" was simpler than in the *History*, he limited the praise to "where in his memoirs he speaks of Falkland" ²⁸.

The paper *A French Critic on Milton* is primarily a presentation to the public of *The Quarterly*, in an unsigned review, of Edmond Schérer's essay on Milton in his *Etudes Critiques de littérature*, which had appeared in 1876. The article is built upon a series of scrupulous and eloquent translations; in revising it Arnold turned his attention towards his translations rather than towards his reflections. Arnold's methods in translation will be examined in another chapter of this work.

Of his other modifications, only two need to be considered. Milton, from having been an "offence" to "one of our great English parties" becomes its "bugbear" ²⁹. Very important is the reduction of the energetic assertion: "Some moral qualities are certainly connected in a man with his power of style" to the tentative: "Some moral qualities seem to be connected" ³⁰. This reduction should be set before all persons who interpret in a moralistic sense the key phrase of Matthew Arnold's aesthetic doctrine: "a criticism of life". It is a slight indication of Arnold's emergence, at the close of the "seventies", from the extreme of his Hebraism.

The paper *A French Critic on Goethe* is exactly analogous to the preceding paper, based on another of the *Etudes* of Edmond Schérer. The general remarks made above apply integrally to it as well. Three minor modifications merit rapid comment. Where he had written in blindest irony: "Probably he will not tell us that 'the Eternal created Goethe to be a guide to the universe'", alluding to Schérer's correction of the idolatry of Chateaubriand, Arnold wrote "Certainly..." ³¹. He probably judged the subtlety of his former version excessive. Thinking of the professorship of Schérer at Geneva, he had said, "our Genevese Critic" and, again, in the peroration, "this accomplished Genevese to

27. *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol. X), p. 498. — 28, *Id.*, p. 499. — 29. *Id.* p. 242. — 30. *Id.*, p. 257. — 31. *Id.*, p. 267.

whom they [the French] have given the right of citizenship". This latter phrase is an error of fact, one of the few grave errors of fact in Arnold's criticism; for all his cosmopolitan and Protestant sympathies, Schérer was Paris-born. In 1879 Arnold wrote "our French critic"³² and, in a happy moment "this accomplished senator of theirs with his Geneva training"³³. In grace and adequacy this little correction is a triumph.

The paper on *George Sand* is less a review than a prose elegy: George Sand had died in the year in which Schérer's *Etudes* came from the press. However, this paper contains a very fair proportion of translations and these were revised carefully in the edition of 1879.

Incidental modifications are few. A tribute to the complexity and refinement of civilization becomes more emphatic with the scornful parenthesis "although Prince Bismarck cannot see it"³⁴. The material well-being of the French peasant, in 1877 "generally known", in 1879 is "known to all of us"³⁵. George Sand is in 1879 a "great and ingenuous" soul in a passage which two years before had pronounced her no more than a "great soul"³⁶.

We must pause over a passage transferred and abridged. In 1877 at the end of the vivid introduction, Arnold had paid tribute to the radicalism of the *Fortnightly Review* in which he was writing:

Yes; and it is here that one should speak of her in this Review; not dominated by the past, not devoted to things established, not over-occupied with theology, but in search of some more free and wide conceptions of human life and turned towards the future and the unrealised. George Sand felt the poetry of the past, she had no hatreds; the furies, the follies, the self-deceptions of secularist and revolutionist fanatics filled her in her latter years with pity, sometimes with dismay; but still her place is with the party and propaganda of organic change. For any party tied to the past, for any party, even, tied to the present, she is too new, too bold, too uncompromisingly sincere.

In 1879 this passage, in an abridged form, comes in the

32. *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol. X), p. 282. — 33. *Id.*, p. 297. — 34. *Id.*, p. 322. — 35. *Id.*, p. 321. — 36. *Id.*, p. 327.

course of the conclusion³⁷. The first and last sentences have disappeared, with that lambent radicalism which, coming from Arnold, gives an exhilarating shock. The innocuous second sentence, with certain inversions is maintained. The total suppression of the first and third sentences implies an unpleasant judgment upon the adaptability of Arnold : were they anything more genuine than a sop to the notorious radicalism of Morley and his *Fortnightly*?

37. *Mixed Essays*, (*Works*, vol. X), p. 325.

CHAPTER X

IRISH ESSAYS AND OTHERS

Of *Irish Essays and Others* there are but two distinct texts, the original text of the essays scattered in periodicals and prefaces and the text of the standard edition in book-form of 1882. The so called popular edition of 1903, (now out of print, along with the standard, which was never reprinted), is a page-for-page, word-for-word reproduction of it. The standard edition consists of (1) a *Preface* composed for it (2) *The Incompatibles* which had appeared in two parts in *The Nineteenth Century* for April and June, 1881, (3) *An Unregarded Irish Grievance*, reprinted from *The Fortnightly* for August, 1881, where it had borne the more precise title *Irish Grammar Schools*, (4) *Ecce Convertimur ad Gentes*, reprinted from *The Fortnightly* for February, 1879, (5) *The Future of Liberalism*, reprinted from *The Nineteenth Century* for July, 1880, (6) *A Speech at Eton* which had first been printed in *The Cornhill Magazine* for May, 1879, (7) *The French Play in London* reprinted from *The Nineteenth Century* for August, 1879, (8) *Copyright*, reprinted from *The Fortnightly Review* for March, 1880. (9) *Preface to the First Edition of Poems, 1853*, (10) *Preface to the Second Edition of Poems, 1854*.

To the contentious and strictly contemporary character of the material handled in the first two essays, and especially in the very long and very clever *The Incompatibles*, we may perhaps attribute the number and the interest of the modifications undergone by their text.

Many interesting modifications in *The Incompatibles* appeal to one as evidences that the more Matthew Arnold

studied the plight of Ireland, the more his indignation against the English and, — as he solicitously adds, — the Scotch, middle classes mounted. The revision of his first paragraph, interesting also as a proof of his acute rhetorical sense, reveals the growing gravity of his anxiety. In *The Nineteenth Century* he had struck in his second sentence a bantering note which perceptibly belittled the discussion : “ An additional paper on Irish affairs, even if the Land Bill could be discussed in it, is an offering which, perhaps, people may be expected to receive with weariness and terror rather than with a cheerful welcome¹. ”

One almost sympathizes with the Honourable Lionel Tollemache and Frederic Harrison and evokes the “ high-priest of the kid-gloved persuasion ” and the pouncet-box. But in 1882 Arnold made a clean sweep of this misplaced fooling. The third sentence had run : “ And above all, they may resent being troubled with a paper on these grave and sad affairs by an insignificant person and one who has no special connexion with Ireland². ”

In 1882 by a skilful inversion, he places in the position of prime emphasis, at the end of the sentence and at the end of the paragraph his key phrase : “ Besides, and above all, no one under any circumstances, perhaps, can much care to read what an insignificant person, and one who has no special connexion with Ireland, may have to say about the grave and sad affairs of that country³. ”

The suggestion of the former version is that should an English reader of *The Nineteenth Century* consent to concern himself with the plight of Ireland, to the extent of reading the paper before him, he might congratulate himself upon an act of rare generosity. The suggestion of the second is that England is so concerned with the plight of Ireland, that an inexperienced study of that plight will seem trifling and incongruous.

In the second paragraph “ the Irish ” attain the dignity and sonority of “ the Irish people ”⁴; he had written “ the angry memory of conquest and confiscation... have conti-

1. *Nineteenth Century*, vol. IX, p. 709. — 2. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 3. *Irish Essays and Others*, (*Works*, vol. XI), p. 4.

nued to burn and burn still ", which becomes more emphatic in 1882 as " the... confiscation... have continued, therefore, to irritate and inflame men's minds. They irritate and inflame them still " ⁵; with similar effect " there cannot be fusion and forgetfulness " swells to " there cannot be fusion, there cannot be forgetfulness " ⁶; unpleasant substantives recur, " misery " replaces a pronoun twice within the space of twenty words ⁷; a gratuitous slur upon the Irish is suppressed ⁸; " a remedy for them " becomes more kindly, " a remedy for their ills " ⁹; he had assumed that his *Nineteenth Century* reader " will be anxious ", but in 1882 he goes further, — his reader " will surely be anxious " ¹⁰; the force of an arraignment is more than doubled when for " English misgovernment " he writes " English misgovernment and injustice " ¹¹; in exasperation, for " the British Philistine " he puts " our terrible friend the British Philistine " ¹²; new point is given to a warning when, in a description of the state of Ireland " most serious disorder " replaces a perfunctory " much disorder " ¹³; in the midst of calm expositions sentences are intercalated to recall the purpose of the development; in the peroration of the first paper the regime of the Penal Code had been execrated as a " treatment much worse than Louis the Fourteenth's treatment of French Protestants "; in 1882 Arnold added to a comparison already painful the sting of " much worse, even, than the planters' treatment of their slaves " ¹⁴.

These examples are all taken from the first paper : they mark, do they not, a remarkable intensification of the mood, a remarkable heightening of the colour? In the second paper where the emphasis falls upon an excoriation of the middle class for its general culpability, there is no such interesting sequence of revision.

A number of minor modifications of the first paper require mention and a few invite comment; two passages of mock gratitude are excised, the one from the introduction ¹⁵, the

4. *Irish Essays and Others*, (Works, vol. XI), *loc. cit.* — 5. *Id.*, p. 9. — 6. *Id.*, p. 41. — 7. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 8. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 9. *Id.*, p. 42. — 10. *Id.*, p. 43. — 11. *Id.*, pp. 44-45. — 12. *Id.*, p. 49. — 13. *Id.*, p. 20. — 14. *Id.*, p. 39. — 15. *Nineteenth Century*, vol. IX, p. 709.

other from the conclusion¹⁶; an eulogy of Burke's political method is shaded with certain indistinct reservations¹⁷; the provocative suggestion is offered that Catholic Emancipation "without the Union would probably have been granted much sooner"¹⁸; where in response to a rhetorical question whether the expected Land Bill would be "healing" he had said "it seems impossible to think so" a year moderated his pessimism and enabled "impossible" to give way to "difficult"¹⁹. This last alteration is in harmony with revisions in the second paper and an evidence of the candour and flexibility of Arnold's political attitude.

Out of print, today, and little known even to most readers of Arnold the first paper of *The Incompatibles*, is, in its later form, the product of the most patient and intelligent revision.

The principal modification introduced into the text of the second paper was the suppression of several successive sentences of limpid persuasive prose which it is a pleasure to reclaim from *The Nineteenth Century*:

We do not suppose, even, that we can point out courses which politicians and newspapers, as people and parties now are, will be at all likely to entertain. But we may be able to suggest, perhaps, courses which quiet people may think over in their minds as possible means to help us out of our difficulties, and which will remain to be tried, and to save us from despair, if the means which politicians and newspapers are now recommending, and of which the public mind is full, should prove, when they are tried, not to be successful. In this way we were led to suggest a mode of dealing with the agrarian trouble in Ireland which our politicians and newspapers are not at all likely to entertain, but which to quiet, simple people may perhaps commend itself as reasonable enough, and as offering refuge and hope, if other courses, when they are tried, fail²⁰.

It was a pity that such pleasant competent prose should go; but it was not more than a stagnancy in an essay where the argument moved as swiftly as a hurrying river.

A passage of somewhat questionable generosity to *The*

16. *Nineteenth Century*, vol. IX, p. 725. — 17. *Irish Essays and Others*, (*Works*, vol. XI), p. 13. — 18. *Id.*, p. 19. — 19. *Id.*, p. 22. — 20. *Nineteenth Century*, vol. IX, pp. 1030-1031.

Pall Mall Gazette was also sacrificed. It ran thus : " *The Pall Mall Gazette* says, indeed, or did say formerly, for we will by no means oblige it to remain in a particular opinion which seems unsound²¹ ". In place of this challenging passage stand the innocent words : " The partisans of the Government are fond of saying : ²² ". Another sacrifice is very regrettable. Arnold had written of the Lowland Scotch that they " breed Murdstones as naturally as we do " ²³; the raciness and emphatic brevity of this is replaced by " they breed the same sort of middle class as we do, and naturally do not see their own faults " ²⁴; more lucid, one concedes, and more deftly dovetailing into the paragraph.

Other modifications are minor; a passage is transposed ²⁵, and a valuable illustration heightened thereby; the miserable names of Murdstone and Quinion occur more frequently; the paper gains by the removal of a digressive explanation of their artistic and financial relations ²⁶; the lapse of time requires Arnold to speak of the provisions of the Land Bill in the perfect tense ²⁷; and an emphatic sentence on the implications of middle class Philistinism for Irish Home Rule appears ²⁸.

The paper on *Irish Grammar Schools*, reprinted with the more winning title *An Unregarded Irish Grievance*, underwent no important modifications of matter. In its second form, the tone of the allusions to the English Public Schools comes nearer to enthusiasm ²⁹; the deference to Professeur Mahaffy whose report is the point of departure, is a little more marked ³⁰; exasperation with the middleclass refusal to sanction religious endowment in Irish education finds outlet in one brief expansion ³¹; other modifications do not require mention.

From the paper *Ecce Convertimur ad Gentes*, a long passage interesting in various respects was suppressed. It claims quotation *in toto* :

21. *Nineteenth Century*, vol. IX, *loc. cit.* — 22. *Irish Essays and Others*, (*Works*, vol. XI), p. 51. — 23. *Nineteenth Century*, vol. IX, p. 1036. — 24. *Irish Essays and Others*, (*Works*, vol. XI), p. 62. — 25. *Id.*, p. 63. — 26. *Id.*, p. 68. — 27. *Id.*, pp. 44-46. — 28. *Id.*, p. 70. — 29. *Id.*, p. 90, p. 92. — 30. *E. g. Id.*, p. 82. — 31. *Id.*, p. 83.

Something is always gained by setting our mark high. George Herbert says —

Who aimeth at the sky.

Shoots higher much than he who means a tree.

And I was pausing the other day, for other and personal reasons over a passage in an earlier and much greater poet than George Herbert — the Italian Dante, when it occurred to me that the passage had a good application to such institutions as this College of yours, which I had then been just invited to address. The passage is one describing the end of a favourite hero of old Greek poetry, the much-enduring and ingenious Ulysses, whose end is also the subject of one of Mr. Tennyson's finest poems. Ulysses and his men had been all through that long ten years war in Troy : they had been battered about for ten years more on their way home, and at last they had got home to their Greek island. But Ulysses was possessed with the longing still to see and know more of men and of men's doings, more of nature ; he proposed to go *after the sun*, as he expressed it, outside the Mediterranean, the inland sea on whose shore the Greeks lived, out over the great and wide ocean towards the west and south, and to acquaint himself with the unexplored and unknown world. " I and my companions were old and slow " he says, when this desire came upon him. He imparted it to them in an earnest speech, exhorting them to bestow, with him, the little of life which remained to them upon this high enterprise ; and he concluded with these words : " Consider whereunto ye are born ; made ye were not to live like brutes, but to follow virtue and knowledge. " And this speech so moved his hearers, that after it, says Ulysses, " even if I had wanted to turn them back from the enterprise, I could not have done so ".

This is the story, and now for the application. The application lies in the appeal to the natural desire for virtue and knowledge in men and in its force, even amidst many and great discouragements. " I and my companions are old and slow. " A man of imperfect training and scanty leisure who joins one of these Working Men's Colleges may say ; " we have not the helps and aptitudes which come of constant instruction, constant mental practice ; our time has been spent on other things ; our leisure is short, there are plenty of other calls upon it which are attractive ; and yet here I am, with all this to dissuade me, going after the sun, setting off into the vast and untried ocean of knowledge, where so many have foundered, at a high half-understood call to know myself and the world, What can be driving me ? " What is driving him is the correspondence of the call, however often neglected and however imperfectly obeyed, with the genuine aspiration of human nature. To arrive at a full and right concep-

tion of things, to know oneself and the world — which is knowledge; then to act firmly and manfully on that knowledge — which is virtue; this is the nature, the indestructible impulse of the spirit of man. "Consider whereunto ye are born; ye were not made to live like brutes but to follow virtue and knowledge.

All this some of you may think vague and high-flown but I shall be prosaic enough presently³².

The final sentence of the next to last paragraph recurred (and was there retained) as an italicized conclusion to the essay; the penultimate sentence was not suppressed³³.

Why was this passage of prose at once elaborate and fluent and even more fluent than elaborate suppressed? Not, I think, because of a defective relation with the essay as a whole or with the neighbouring parts of it; but rather because of the implicit equivalence of Ulysses haranguing his aged companions and Matthew Arnold delivering a lay sermon to the workingmen of Ipswich. The equivalence of the two audiences is explicitly and even emphatically stated; the complementary equivalence with all its humorous and semi-serious content must occur to any leisurely critical reader.

Other modifications in this essay are minor and require no comment or mention.

The paper *The Future of Liberalism* underwent a few incidental material modifications, most important among which are certain explanatory phrases which obviate too great a strain upon the political memory of a reader³⁴; a few junctive sentences contribute to smooth the flow of the argument; a few new shadings of emphasis appear; and, finally the adding of "even" in the following sentence seasons the humour richly: "It is better even to have readings from Eliza Cook in the parish church-yard than to have fractious clergymen armed with the power of refusing to bury the children of Baptists³⁵."

The modifications introduced into the text of *A Speech at Eton* attest Matthew Arnold's persistent quest of clearness and intelligibility but do not invite individual comment.

32. *Fortnightly Review* (New Series), vol. XXV, pp. 240-241. — 33. *Irish Essays and Others*, (Works, vol. XI), p. 133. — 34. *Id.*, e. g. p. 137. — 35. *Id.*, p. 168.

The second form of *The French Play in London* is notable for certain shafts aimed at the vanguard of the English decadents; the ideal of *l'homme sensuel moyen* which he had assailed years before in *Literature and Dogma* he here mentions as : " An ideal which our young literary generation now out on the war-path here in England, seek to adopt from France and which they busily preach and work for³⁶. " And in a second allusion to this ideal, he inserts the biting phrase : " Notwithstanding the fervid adhesion to it of our young generation³⁷. " 1880 is the year of *The City of Dreadful Night*; 1881 is the year of Wilde's poems. These allusions, added in 1882, mark an unexpected interest in the contemporary movement and, doing so, are of the first importance for the intellectual history of Arnold in his last decade.

In 1879 he had referred to Chaucer's " just use " of the ten syllable couplet; in 1882 he finds it a " just and perfect use "³⁸. The ultimate source of the modification is probably the *Introduction* to Ward's *The English Poets* which is charming on Chaucer and was written in the interim, (1880).

The modifications of the text of the paper on *Copyright* are in general insignificant; no suppression of moment was made; a curious passage on the evils of lending libraries³⁹ and another on half-a-crown editions, no less curious were added⁴⁰; a paragraph was rearranged; certain proper names were replaced by functional designations⁴¹; finally there were a few new shadings of emphasis.

In his *Preface to Irish Essays and Others* Matthew Arnold says of the prefaces reprinted in this volume, " exactly as they stand I should not have written them now ". This semi-apologetic remark suggests, and it is the fact, that the prefaces were scarcely revised. The modifications of the longer preface, that of 1853 are almost exclusively external; the modifications of the very short and plain preface of 1854 are either external or formal. The sole modification which requires mention and comment is the change of " the European mind since Voltaire " to " the European mind in our

36. *Irish Essays and Others*, (*Works*. vol. XI), p. 221. — 37. *Id.*, p. 223. — 38. *Id.*, p. 212. — 39. *Id.*, p. 252. — 40. *Id.*, p. 254. — 41. *Id.*, e. g. p. 258.

own day''⁴². Is this another instance of the wane of Matthew Arnold's devotion to France as the pivot of contemporary society and culture? Or, since the context is dramatic, is it perhaps an inevitable result of the study of Voltaire's tragic drama undertaken by the author of a later *Merope*?

⁴². *Irish Essays and Others*, (*Works*, vol. XI), p. 295.

CHAPTER XI

DISCOURSES IN AMERICA

Two of the three *Discourses in America* exist in two texts only : the discourse on *Literature and Science* and the discourse on *Numbers : or the Majority and the Remnant* appeared first in *The Nineteenth Century* (for August, 1882 and April, 1884 respectively), and subsequently in the standard edition in book-form of 1885. The third discourse — *Emerson* — exists not only as a periodical paper — it appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for May, 1884 — and as the third of the discourses in the standard edition, but also in manuscript and in page-proof¹.

The discourse on *Numbers* had, before its first publication, been delivered in " the great towns " of America from Boston to Cincinnati. Writing from Cincinnati, Matthew Arnold admits : " I now *speak* it almost entirely, as it is getting lodged in my memory². " The frequency of its delivery before its first publication is the plausible cause of the infrequency and insignificance of the revisions made in preparation for its second form.

A sentence was inserted to balance a partisan account of the failure of the Reformation in France — a sentence which is creditable to the Hellene in Matthew Arnold, so deplorably submerged in this discourse³. " The last days of Plato's life " become " the very last days⁴ " ; a Biblical text

1. The manuscript and the page-proof are in the Widener Library at Harvard, a gift of Charles Eliot Norton, Arnold's host during his stay in Cambridge. No other manuscript of Arnold's prose exists. — 2. *Letters*, (ed. Russell), vol. II, p. 259. — 3. *Discourses in America*, (*Works*, vol. IV), p. 304. — 4. *Id.*, p. 288.

is abbreviated⁵; and a prudent "perhaps", moderates a confession somewhat damaging⁶.

The periodical version of *Literature and Science* is a transcript not of an American discourse but of the Rede Lecture delivered at Cambridge in 1882. Delivered so often during the autumn of 1883 and the winter of 1884, that its author was "bored at having to repeat my 'Literature and Science' "⁷, it inevitably underwent revision both adaptative and corrective.

The most interesting aspect of its revision is the adaptative aspect: it presents noteworthy testimony to Arnold's proficiency in the quest and maintenance of an audience's interest. He began his storm of the citadel of physical science with a vigorous defence of literature and the practice of literature:

No wisdom, nor counsel, nor understanding, against the Eternal! says the Wise Man. Against the natural and appointed course of things there is no contending. Ten years ago I remarked on the gloomy prospect for letters in this country, inasmuch as while the aristocratic class, according to a famous dictum of Lord Beaconsfield, was totally indifferent to letters, the friends of physical science on the other hand, a growing and popular body, were in active revolt against them. To deprive letters of the too great place they had hitherto filled in man's estimation and to substitute other studies for them, was now the object, I observed, of a sort of crusade with the friends of physical science, — a busy host, important in itself, important because of the gifted leaders who march at its head, important from its strong and increasing hold upon public favour.

I could not help, I then went on to say, I could not help being moved with a desire to plead with the friends of physical science on behalf of letters and in deprecation of the slight which they put upon them. But from giving effect to this desire I was at that time drawn off by more pressing matters. Ten years have passed, and the prospects of any pleader for letters have certainly not mended. If the friends of physical science were in the morning sunshine of popular favour even then, they stand now in its meridian radiance. Sir Josiah Mason founds a college at Birmingham to exclude "mere literary instruction and education"; and at its opening a brilliant and charming debater, Professor Huxley, is

5. *Discourses in America*, (*Works*, vol. IV), p. 312. — 6. *Id.*, p. 314. — 7. *Letters*, (ed. Russell), vol. II, p. 232.

brought down to pronounce their funeral oration. Mr. Bright, in his zeal for the United States, exhorts young people to drink deep of '*Hiawatha*'; and the *Times*, which takes the gloomiest view possible of the future of letters and thinks that a hundred years hence there will only be a few eccentrics reading letters and almost every one will be studying the natural sciences⁸...

After dwelling at impressive length upon the magnitude and arduousness of his enterprise, after mellifluously lulling his Cambridge audience into an opinion of impregnable security, Matthew Arnold abruptly turns upon them :

But to resign oneself too passively to supposed designs of the Eternal is fatalism. Perhaps they are not really designs of the Eternal at all, but designs — let us for example say — of Mr. Herbert Spencer. Still the design of abasing what is called "mere literary instruction and education" and of exalting what is called 'sound extensive and practical scientific knowledge' is a very positive design and makes great progress...

The Vice-Chancellor has done me the honour to invite me to address you here to-day, although I am not a member of this great University. Your liberally conceived use of Sir Robert Rede's lecture leaves you free in the choice of a person to deliver the lecture founded by him, and on the present occasion the Vice-Chancellor has gone for a lecturer to the sister University. I will venture to say that to an honour of this kind from the University of Cambridge, no one on earth can be so sensible as a member of the University of Oxford⁹.

There follows a comparison of the two Universities, the suppression of which is an irreparable loss, a loss which induces a regret that when the paper was republished in book-form, Matthew Arnold did not revert to its Cambridge version :

The two Universities are unlike anything else in the world and they are very like one another. Neither of them is inclined to go hastily into raptures over her own living offspring or over her sister's; each of them is peculiarly sensitive to the good opinion of the other. Nevertheless, they have their points of dissimilarity. One such point, in particular, cannot fail to arrest notice. Both Universities have told powerfully upon the mind and life of the nation. But the University of Oxford, of which I am a member

8. *The Nineteenth Century*, vol. XII, p. 216. — 9. *Id.*, p. 217.

and to which I am deeply and affectionately attached, has produced great men, indeed, but has above all been the source or the centre of great movements. We will not now go back to the middle ages; we will keep within the range of what is called modern history. Within this range we have the great movements of Royalism, Wesleyanism, Tractarianism, Ritualism, all of these having their source or their centre in Oxford. The movement taking its name from Charles Simeon is far, far less considerable than the movement taking its name from John Wesley. The movement attempted by the Latitude men in the seventeenth century is next to nothing as a movement; the men are everything. And this is in truth your great, your surpassing distinction: not your movements, but your men. From Bacon to Byron what a splendid roll of great names you can point to. We at Oxford can show nothing equal to it. Yours is the University not of great movements, but of great men. Our experience at Oxford disposes us, perhaps, to treat movements, whether our own, or extraneous movements such as the present movement for revolutionising education, with too much respect. That disposition finds a corrective here. Masses make movements, individualities explode them. On mankind in the mass, a movement, once started, is apt to impose itself by routine; it is through the insight, the independence, the self-confidence of powerful single minds that its yoke is shaken off. In this University of great names, whoever wishes not to be demoralised by a movement, comes into the right air for being stimulated to pluck up his courage and to examine what stuff movements are really made of¹⁰.

All of this, so studiously attuned to the occasion, was of necessity excised in the adaptation of the lecture to a variety of American audiences, rural, urban, metropolitan. It gives place to an introduction equally apposite, developing, from a simile taken from Plato's *Republic*, rational grounds for American indifference to letters. The technique does not vary; but the new occasion is inferior to the old.

The conclusion of the Rede Lecture also required adaptation. An important inversion was made whereby the graceful and faintly ironical allusion to Ruskin¹¹, the close of the Rede Lecture, comes some hundreds of words before the close of the American discourse which Professor Beach has very justly described as "his final gravely cadenced pre-

10. *The Nineteenth Century*, vol. XII, pp. 217-218. — 11. *Id.*, p. 230.

diction¹² " that " the majority of men will always require human letters; and so much the more, as they have the more and the greater results of science to relate to the need in man for conduct, and to the need in him for beauty "¹³. An adaptation or a correction? Perhaps in this instance a distinction is merely methodological. It may be observed, however, that few of Matthew Arnold's conclusions are " gravely cadenced ", not the conclusion of *Culture and Anarchy*, nor that of *Literature and Dogma*, nor that of *God and the Bible*. Among his major works, only *St. Paul and Protestantism* has such a conclusion; but that he admired sufficiently to include it in the *Prose Passages*¹⁴, the anthology from his works by which he set such store. This, at any rate, may be affirmed: his former conclusion was admirably adapted to its audience, as this latter was admirably adapted to the avid idealism of America.

Some of the minor adaptations to the American audiences indicate a quantum of superiority; a Latin text from Leonardo de Vinci is translated¹⁵; a mention of Huxley is expanded to serve as a compendious introduction to him¹⁶; the Styx is carefully presented as a " river "¹⁷; and Socrates is presented with equal care as " the philosopher "¹⁸.

Other modifications are independent of the audience addressed and valuable in themselves; a static representation of Charon " in his ferryboat " becomes an amusing dynamic representation of Charon " punting his ferryboat "¹⁹; Victor Hugo becomes in derision " a sublime poet "²⁰, and Mr. Gladstone " the most admirable of statesmen "²¹. Professor Sylvester had been, in 1882, on the foundation of the Johns Hopkins University and Arnold had spoken of him as " far away in America "; before the republication of the discourse, he was honoured by appointment to the Savilian Chair of Geometry at Oxford and had merited the new words " one of the first mathematicians of

12. Beach : *The Outlook for American Prose*, p. 97. — 13. *Discourses in America*, (Works, vol. IV), pp. 347-348. — 14. *Prose Passages* (*Passages from the Prose Writings of Matthew Arnold*), pp. 281-284. — 15. *Discourses in America*, (Works, vol. IV), p. 346. — 16. *Id.*, p. 322. — 17. *Id.*, p. 329. — 18. *Id.*, p. 333. — 19. *Id.*, p. 329. — 20. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 21. *Id.*, *loc. cit.*

the world " ²² ; Greek " literature " is in the second version supplemented by " art " ²³ and Greek " poems, histories and speeches " by " treatises " ²⁴. The arid fact that " when a taper burns the wax is converted into carbonic acid and water ", taken in 1882 as a type of the inadequacy of scientific studies to satisfy the variety of human instincts active in the process of knowledge, is replaced by the more comically arid fact " the moon is two thousand one hundred and sixty miles in diameter " ²⁵.

Other material modifications do not require mention or comment.

The modifications of the discourse on *Emerson* are extraordinarily numerous; and among them the most important are those which illustrate a change in Matthew Arnold's attitude toward his subject. Most and, indeed, almost all of such modifications occurred between the printing of the " Revise ", from which Arnold read his lecture, and its publication in the *Macmillan's Magazine* once the American tour was over. The *Boston Advertiser*, in its report of the second delivery of the Emerson discourse in Boston, said, on December 15, 1883 : " The lecturer had not toned down or toned up anything in his critique of Emerson since the first occasion of its reading in Boston. ' And *Harper's Weekly*, for December 1883, in giving Arnold's list of representative masters of literature, in some measure confirms this : the list appears as in the " Revise ", — Cicero, Plato, Swift, Voltaire —, whereas in the periodical publication, the names of Bacon and Pascal were added. It is probable that the changes were made one by one, a few perhaps before the end of 1883, the others before May 1884 when the paper appeared in the *Macmillan's Magazine*.

In the " Revise " he wrote : " Of not one single passage in Emerson's poetry can it be truly said that it has become a familiar quotation... " In the *Macmillan's Magazine* he added : " It is not enough that it should be familiar to his admirers, familiar in New England, familiar even throughout the United States; it must be familiar to all readers and

²². *Discourses in America*, (*Works*, vol. IV), p. 334. — ²³. *Id.*, p. 326. — ²⁴. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — ²⁵. *Id.*, p. 343.

lovers of English poetry²⁶. ” Similarly, for emphasis and clarity, a few lines later Arnold added to the sentence : “ And in truth, one of the legitimate poets, Emerson, in my opinion is not ”²⁷, this provocative formulation : “ His poetry is interesting, it makes one think; but it is not the poetry of one of the born poets²⁸. ” He suppressed from the periodical text what was perhaps the most remarkable pronouncement in the discourse, the judgment in the lines : “ Take the plain and grand line which though not of entire precision in its grammar is yet in my opinion the finest line he ever wrote :

‘ All, all was given, and only health denied²⁹. ’

The only other pronouncement which might compete with this is in the celebrated sentence : “ As Wordsworth’s poetry is, in my judgment, the most important work done in verse, in our language, during the present century, so Emerson’s *Essays* are the most important work done in prose³⁰. ”

So ran the text of the “ Revise ” ; in *Macmillan’s Magazine* a protective “ I think ” was inserted after *Essays*³¹. The more enthusiastic elements of the celebrated eulogy of Hawthorne as the literary talent “ of the first order, the finest, I think, which America has yet produced ” were added in the “ Revise ”. It may be said, then that far from compromising with the popular outcry that he did not set sufficient store by Emerson, Arnold considered that he had gone somewhat too far in praise; and here and there introduced incidental qualifications of it.

A very few additions express greater kindness or added knowledge either of Emerson or of some other aspect of the American scene. “ America ”, he had written in the “ Revise ” “ is a young country, and young countries, like young persons, are apt to evince in their judgments some want of scale and measure ”. The addition of “ sometimes ” after “ apt ” and the qualification of “ judgments ” by “ literary ” in the periodical text moderate the criticism³².

26. *Macmillan’s Magazine*, vol. L, p. 3. — 27. “ Revise ” and manuscript. — 28. *Macmillan’s Magazine*, *loc. cit.* — 29. “ Revise ” and manuscript. — 30. *Id.* — 31. *Macmillan’s Magazine*, vol. L, p. 41. — 32. *Id.*, p. 3.

Emerson had been in the "Revise" "this rare spirit" and becomes "this beautiful and rare spirit". An extraordinarily harsh judgment of certain rather Asiatic expressions of Emerson, — "unsound... and in a style impossible to a born man of letters"³³, — is tempered, in the edition in book-form, by placing an "almost" before the damning "impossible". The spirit of a crucial passage, that in which Arnold at last begins to make claims for Emerson, is greatly clarified by the insertion in the periodical text, near the beginning, of the phrase "yet it is a relation of, I think, even superior importance"³⁴. Perhaps it was in compensation for this concession that he for the same text, and in the following sentence, indicated his opinion of his audience by specifying Marcus Aurelius to have been a *Roman* Emperor³⁵. References to Brook Farm and to New England farms in general are brought into the periodical text³⁶.

Certain changes in style are triumphs. In the "Revise" he wrote of the Church of England as "the most present, the most practical, the most established, the most national institution in the world"³⁷; in the periodical text he simplified this to "the most national and natural institution in the world"³⁸, at once clearer, more powerful, and more expressive. Other stylistic modifications are similar in spirit and in success. I shall illustrate them by tracing the development of the eloquent last sentences of the discourse. First let us have these sentences as they stood in the first draft :

I represent him to my mind as still standing there at Concord in his habit as he lived but with ampler form and starry (?)³⁹ illumined feature stretching out one hand towards the East, to our laden and labouring England; the other toward the evergrowing West, towards his own dearly-loved 'great, intelligent, sensual and avaricious America'. To us he beckons for guidance to his cheerfulness and hope; to you his dignity, serenity, elevation⁴⁰.

33. *Macmillan's Magazine*, vol. L, p. 5. — 34. *Id.*, p. 8. — 35. *Id.*, *loc. cit.* — 36. *E. g. Id.*, pp. 9-10. — 37. "Revise". — 38. *Id.*, p. 1. — 39. The word is almost indecipherable. This is a conjecture. — 40. Where the readings of this text differ from those given below the words have been scored and are sometimes difficult to read.

Such is the first draft; in the manuscript itself its most palpable shortcomings are corrected. The phrase, overstrained and vague, "with ampler form... feature" is scored and replaced by "of heightened stature and shining feature"⁴¹, a phrase with balance, simplicity and grace. "To us he beckons" is awkward, and gives place to "To us he shows"⁴², which agrees better with the context. In the "Revise" "represent" is replaced by the more vivid "figure"; "there at Concord" is expanded to "here by Boston Bay or at his own Concord"; "stretching out one hand" to the more statuesque "with one hand stretched out"; "his lucid freedom" is inserted among the elements of guidance for the English; and "delicacy" among the elements of guidance for America. In the periodical version "America" is inserted after "dearly-loved", lending a new emphasis and force to the sentence⁴³. There are other changes of less moment. The final version runs :

I figure him to my mind as visible upon earth still, as still standing here by Boston Bay or at his own Concord, in his habit as he lived, but of heightened stature and shining feature with one hand stretched out towards the East, to our laden and labouring England; the other towards the ever-growing West, to his own dearly-loved America, — 'great, intelligent, sensual, avaricious America.' To us he shows for guidance his lucid freedom, his cheerfulness and hope; to you his dignity, delicacy, serenity, elevation⁴.

Regularity, precision, uniformity, balance, these were the qualities which Arnold looked for in prose, and it is instructive to see how in his own prose he achieves them.

41. Manuscript. — 42. *Id.* — 43. *Macmillan's Magazine*, vol. L. p. 43. —

44. *Discourses in America*, (*Works*, vol. IV), p. 382.

CHAPTER XII

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

(SECOND SERIES)

Essays in Criticism, Second Series, was published in 1888, the very year of Matthew Arnold's death. It was a posthumous publication, with no preface by the author, but with a *Prefatory Note* by the Lord Chief Justice of England, an intimate friend. Lord Coleridge tells us at the beginning of this note that "the collection of Essays contained in this volume was made by Mr. Arnold himself"¹. Collected, then, they were by Matthew Arnold, but not perfectly prepared for publication since they remained without a preface. What, then, is the status of the text of this edition? It contains four modifications; the papers on Gray and Keats, reprinted from Ward's *English Poets* have been shorn of their introductory summaries²; in the paper on *Shelley* "loveable" is reduced to "lovable"³; in the paper on Amiel "mental pathology" replaces the harsh "morbid pathology"⁴. The first two modifications may be editorial and the third a printer's notion; the fourth must, I believe, be attributed to Arnold. In no other respect does the text of the essays collected here differ from the text of their previous publication.

The essay on *The Study of Poetry* is the same work as the Introduction to *Ward's English Poets* which began to come out in 1880; the lecture on *Milton*, after its delivery in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, had appeared in *The*

1. *Essays in Criticism, Second Series*, (*Works*, vol. IV), p. ix. — 2. *The English Poets* (ed. T. H. Ward), vol. III, pp. 302-303; vol. IV, pp. 427-428. — 3. *Essays in Criticism, Second Series*, (*Works*, vol. IV), p. 157. — 4. *Id.*, p. 231.

Century Magazine for May, 1888 (posthumous); the notes on *Gray* and *Keats* had appeared in the third and fourth volumes, respectively of Ward's *English Poets*; the paper on *Wordsworth* had first appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for July, 1879, and then, revised, as a *Preface* to *Poems of Wordsworth*, published in the same year in the *Golden Treasury Series*; the paper on *Byron* had first appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for March, 1881, and then, revised, in a companion volume to the *Poems of Wordsworth*, as *Preface* to the *Poetry of Byron* (1881); the paper on *Shelley* had appeared in *The Nineteenth Century* for January, 1888; the paper on *Count Leo Tolstoi* had appeared in *The Fortnightly Review* for December, 1887; and the paper on *Amiel* was reprinted from *Macmillan's Magazine* for September, 1887.

The only papers which require examination are those on *Wordsworth* and *Byron*, of which there are two distinct texts anterior to *Essays in Criticism, Second Series*.

Two substantial passages were suppressed from the paper on *Wordsworth* when it was reprinted as a *Preface*.

The first was provoked by Renan's *Discours de Réception à l'Académie Française* :

And when M. Renan presents himself to the French Academy, — the only authentic dispensers, he says, of glory, of 'this grand light,' — he presents himself supported by M. Victor Hugo, his 'dear and illustrious master,' a poet irradiated with it; a poet 'whose genius has throughout our century struck the hour for us, has given body to every one of our dreams, wings to every one of our thoughts.' Yet probably not twenty people in that magnificent assemblage, all coruscating with the beams of the 'grand light; had ever even heard of Wordsworth's name. And it is quite impossible for us to esteem recognition by the French Academy, or by the French nation, or by any single nation or institution, as so decisive a title to glory as M. Renan supposes it¹.

The other passage, if less obviously excrescent, is similar in temper and may be examined along with the above :

Or again judgment may go the other way. Byron has had an immense reputation, not in England only but on the Continent. M. Taine, in his history of English literature, takes Byron as

5. *Macmillan's Magazine*, vol XL, p. 494.

seriously as he takes Shakespeare. Byron is the supreme and incomparable expression of the English genius after eight centuries of preparation, he is the one single contemporary author who has *atteint à la cime* 'reached the summit'. *Manfred* is the twin brother of *Faust*. But then M. Schérer strikes in with his words of truth and soberness. Remarking that 'Byron is one of our French superstitions', he points out how Byron's talent is oratorical rather than poetical; he points out how to high and serious art, art impersonal and disinterested, Byron never could rise; and how the man in Byron, finally, is even less sincere than the poet. And by this we may perceive that we have not in Byron what we have in Milton and Shakespeare, — a poetical reputation which time and the authentic judgment of mankind will certainly accept and consecrate.

So excellent a writer and critic as M. Renan sees in M. Victor Hugo, a 'beloved and illustrious master whose voice has throughout our century struck the hour for us.' Of these 'striking of the hour' by the voice of M. Victor Hugo, none certainly was more resonant, none was hailed with more passionate applause by his friends than *Hernani*. It is called for again, made to strike over again; we have the privilege of hearing it strike in London. And still there is no lack of applause to this work of a talent 'combining' says Théophile Gautier 'the qualities of Corneille and of Shakespeare.' But I open by chance a little volume, the conversations of Goethe with the Chancellor Von Müller. There I come upon this short sentence; 'Goethe said *Hernani* was an absurd composition'. *Hernani sei eine absurde Composition*. So speaks this great foreign witness; a German, certainly, but a German favourable to French literature and to France, "to which" said he 'I owe so much of my culture!' So speaks Goethe, the critic who above all others may count as European and whose judgment on the value of a work of modern poetry is the judgment which will, we may be almost sure, at last prevail generally⁶.

It is difficult to applaud the suppression of fervent passages like these, where Matthew Arnold discards the toga and writes like a gladiator rather than an elderly senator of criticism. The passages were not, I think, suppressed as intemperate, excessive; criticism as wrong-headed, upon French poetry, was retained at the beginning of the essay on Heine, to be gracefully demolished by M. Legouis⁷; cri-

6. *Macmillan's Magazine*, vol XL. pp. 195-196. — 7. Emile Legouis: *Défense de la poésie française à l'usage des lecteurs anglais*, pp. 15-21.

ticism as vociferous, upon French character and conduct was retained in the eleventh chapter of *Literature and Dogma*, to alarm J.-M. Guyau into writing some of the greatest pages of *L'Irreligion de l'Avenir*⁸.

Possibly the passage on Byron was the first to be scrapped. It is in irreconcilable contradiction with the paper on Byron published two years later. It is of capital importance for the historian of Matthew Arnold's literary opinions to note that the puzzling fervour of his admiration for Byron was a development of the last decade.

The genesis of the passage in which Renan and Victor Hugo are flagellated is given in the *Letters* and is discreditable from an artistic point of view. Matthew Arnold was reading the discourse of Renan and taking it very badly, pronouncing that Renan's soundness was not a match for his "brilliancy", just in the period when he was composing his paper⁹. His annoyance must have clamoured for expression with sufficient intensity to dull his sense of the tone natural and proper to an article on Wordsworth. A perception that he had perpetrated an irrelevance, and which is worse, failed to complete his article on the proper level of artistic abstraction, must have dictated the suppression of the development.

A similar genesis for the much less culpable passage upon Byron is not provable. Eleven months later however Matthew Arnold wrote to Taine, on the occasion of sending him a copy of *Mixed Essays*, that he "had been re-reading your History of English Literature and had for the first time done proper justice to the energy, power, judgment and knowledge with which the subject is treated"¹⁰. Another vivid impression. It is necessary to note, besides, that the date of 1880, given by Mr. Roe¹¹, for Arnold's letter is placed within brackets, and that the date of the volume *Mixed Essays* is 1879.

It is interesting, in completing our hunt for factitious elements in these passages, to discover that with Goethe, too,

8. Guyau : *L'Irreligion de l'Avenir*, pp. 213-221. — 9. *Letters*, (ed. Russell), vol. II, pp. 454-459. — 10. F. C. Roe : *Taine et l'Angleterre*, p. 176. — 11. *Id.*, loc. cit.

Arnold was occupied in the first months of 1879. He was probably revising his paper *A French Critic on Goethe* for its reappearance in *Mixed Essays*¹².

We have gone far into the crepuscular country of conjecture : our excuse must be the immense intrinsic importance of the text examined. We are entitled to adapt to our defense the statement of M. Koszul : " It is, no doubt, sufficient excuse for such discussions, that the slightest word spoken or written by that most spontaneous of poets (Shelley) is full of personal import¹³. " The slightest modification practised by that most reflective of essayists, — Arnold, is full of artistic import.

It is, in any case, sure, that a principal ground for the suppression of these passages was their artistic and material irrelevance : they are at once a deformation of the essay's structure and a digression from its theme and manner. They do not elucidate Wordsworth ; and the foreign fields in which they range have no explicit or implicit connection with the being of Wordsworth.

The other modifications introduced into the text are either incidental or obviously adaptative ; a paragraph is added to explain the principles of the anthology¹⁴ ; an admission of Wordsworth's inferiority to " Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, even Goethe " takes a form more hospitable to the claims of modern continental writers, suppressing the grudging " even ", and adding after " Milton ", " Molière "¹⁵ ; a somewhat elaborate sentence from Henry Cochin is called " a single sentence " more aptly than " one short sentence "¹⁶ ; the date of Wordsworth's death is corrected from 1852 to 1850¹⁷.

The paper on *Byron* underwent fewer and much less significant modifications. Two brief passages consider the principles of the anthology¹⁸ ; Byron is pressed into service as a foil to " Liberal peers " of Matthew Arnold's day with their subservience to a Philistine regime¹⁹ ; Byron's poetry is con-

¹². *Letters*, (ed. Russell), vol. II, pp. 450-451. — ¹³. A. Koszul : *Shelley's Prose*, p. 6. — ¹⁴. *Poems of Wordsworth, chosen and edited by Matthew Arnold*, p. xxv. — ¹⁵. *Id.*, loc. cit. — ¹⁶. *Id.*, p. ix. — ¹⁷. *Id.*, p. vi. — ¹⁸. *Poetry of Byron, chosen and arranged by Matthew Arnold*, p. xii, p. xxix. — ¹⁹. *Id.*, p. xxvi.

ceded greater power to please than Wordsworth's has²⁰; and an excessive depreciation of Byron to the advantage of Shelley: "At a thousand points Shelley was immeasurably Byron's superior" is revised to the reasonable comparison: "As a man Shelley is at a number of points immeasurably Byron's superior²¹".

20. *Poetry of Byron, chosen and arranged by Matthew Arnold*, p. xxx. —

21. *Id.*, p. viii.

A NOTE ON MATTERS OF STYLE

Mechanics of Presentation : An oddity of Matthew Arnold's periodical publications is their multiplicity of dashes and paucity of commas. In his revision for editions in book-form he inserted commas but retained the dashes, achieving a surprising emphasis. Aside from this, most of the mechanical modifications are explicable as *aeration*, — to borrow a singularly happy expression from M. Digeon, — that is, as mitigation of the density of structure. A comma often becomes a semi-colon ; a semi-colon or a colon becomes a period ; a paragraph is broken in two or three and even, upon occasion, in four. The process of aeration, sporadic before the revision of *Culture and Anarchy* in 1869, became in the last two decades of Matthew Arnold's life, a constant resort. It was applied in popular editions with as much (and no more) persistency, as in standard editions ; in this respect since the popular editions were subsequent their text should be honoured as definitive. It is in line with Matthew Arnold's general practice that papers delivered as lectures before publication were rarely revised in many mechanical particulars. An adroitly aerated style makes for accuracy and ease of apprehension as well as for a steady fluidity of language, but it is a potential menace to continuity, a matter of grave importance.

Continuity : The principal menace of drastic aeration is a tendency to relaxation of unemphatic continuity, a quality which is one of Matthew Arnold's major rhetorical arts, subordinated to continuity of substance. In an aerated passage, for the security of continuity, Matthew

Arnold ordinarily resorts to brief unemphatic connectives, sometimes temperate negatives, sometimes repeated pronouns or adverbs, sometimes merely coordinate conjunctions. When an unemphatic connective had previously been present, it is developed to an emphatic connective; if a pronoun it is substituted by a substantive or aggregate of substantives repetitive of the preceding sentences; if a brief conjunction or unemphatic adverb, it is substituted by a fixative word or carefully built phrase, recalling the context. Aside from the counteraction of aeration, emphasis of continuity is often improved. It is interesting, also, to discover that when aeration has been practised in a given version, continuity is often emphasized only in subsequent versions. Many sentences which make no substantive addition but have admirable junctive qualities are tardy emendations. In fact it is true by and large that an emendation, founded, as is not surprising, on comprehensive calculation of its function, gives, as an ultimate text, a form superior to that developed in an immediate counteraction.

Another means to the security or amelioration of continuity is the suppression or curtailment of digressions. Illustrations of their curtailment or suppression have been given elsewhere in this work. Nothing is more honourable to Matthew Arnold's artistic consciousness than the suppression or drastic curtailment of digressive passages, well-composed as units, significant and even opportune in their content. The counteractive efficacy of these resources is considerable.

Vivacity : The danger of even, uninterrupted continuity is in monotony or dilution, in fine, a certain faintness. Matthew Arnold averted this danger by adding to the vivacity of single words, substantives, adjectives, verbs. A few instances will be given.

(A) *Verbs* : " To represent " becomes " to be sent to Parliament by ", " inclined " becomes " tempted ", " think they have ", becomes " fancied themselves to have ", " creates " becomes " begets ", " mind " becomes " dread ", " corrupt " becomes " rot ", " make this error " becomes " fall into this error ", " die and re-exist " becomes " die

and come to life ", manifested " becomes " uncovered " and subsequently " brought to light ".

(B) *Substantives* : " check " becomes " blight ", " object " becomes " thing ", " conception " becomes " scheme ", " inertness " becomes " poverty ", " ministers " becomes " pastors ", " offence " becomes " bugbear ", " trades unions " becomes " rattening ".

(C) *Adjectives* : " first faults " becomes " plain faults ", " great " becomes " beneficent " or " illustrious ", " imaginative youth " becomes " fresh enthusiastic youth ", " keen " becomes " poignant " or " staunch ". None of these modifications is a significant inflection of the sense ; their value is tonal.

Translation : No aspect of the multiform revision of his prose work does such honour to the inexorable craftsman's conscience of Matthew Arnold, proves so surely the microscopic scrutiny to which these works were subjected in revision, as the minute ameliorations of the passages translated from French writers.

The volume *Mixed Essays* is the most attractive example of this revision. In the paper *A French Critic on Goethe*, Matthew Arnold had, in his first version expanded the phrase "*la prétention et le procédé*" to " the aim at being original and the way of proceeding to be so ". The word " proceeding " doubtless owed its choice to its correspondence with *procédé* ; in the second version for " proceeding to be so " Matthew Arnold substituted the lighter phrase " of setting about it ". In the same passage he rectified a mistranslation of "*après*" by " ever " to the irreproachable " subsequently ". In a later passage in the same paper where he had rendered "*nos sociétés modernes*" by the overliteral " our modern societies ", he adopted the idiomatic singular " our modern society " and inflected a following pronoun and verb to match. In another passage he had chosen for "*enfoncer*" " force in " but rallied in revision to the more vivacious and forcible " beat in ".

He also modified in revision a faulty paragraphing on the part of Schérer.

In the paper *George Sand* he had first mistranslated

" *soufflant avec effroi et dédain sur la nourriture* " by " *sniffing with uneasiness and disdain at the provender* ", an error rectified in the second version where the passage runs " blowing uneasily and fastidiously on the provender ". He had needlessly or heedlessly pluralized " *bouvier* " into " ox-herds ", and in 1879 he restored the singular. The literal " one " in the same passage gave way to the idiomatic " we ". The translation of " *savoir-vivre* " by the single substantive " tact " he found inadequate and coupled with it " politeness "; and where he had retained " *suffrage* " for a translation of its French correspondent, he put " franchise ".

Other minute ameliorations were made in *Essays in Criticism*. In the paper on *Eugénie de Guérin* similar modifications were made. In 1863 Lamennais was made to perform the impropriety of " setting forth to the east ", when Paris was his point of departure and Brittany his destination. In 1865, the error, brought about, doubtless, by the similarity of *l'est* and *l'ouest* was rectified and Lamennais sets decorously out " for the West ". Another mistake, probably typographical, was committed in rendering this passage from *The Centaur*, " *j'ai noué mes bras autour du buste des centaures et du corps des héros et du tronc des chênes* ", where the excellent rhetorical effect depends upon the exact alternation of singular and plural, by " I have wound my arms round the bust of Centaurs and round the body of heroes, and round the *trunks* of oaks. In 1865 " *trunks* " was changed to " *trunk* ".

CONCLUDING NOTE

In his charming preface to *Le Texte des Romans de Fielding*, M. Digeon prays that his author may find, after many editors and publishers preoccupied with elegance and expense, one preoccupied with the text. I offer the same prayer for Matthew Arnold. The crux in the determination of the best text of Arnold's prose writings is the status of the popular editions. Luckily, or unluckily, but three of his works appeared in a genuine popular edition during the lifetime of the author, — *Literature and Dogma*, *God and the Bible*, *St. Paul and Protestantism*. Other popular editions are merely word-for-word reprints of standard editions. But these three are major works : they make up the best of Arnold's religious criticism, they contain passages of suave persuasion and mortal irony not easy to match and, as their quota in *Prose Passages*, Arnold's anthology of his own work, proves, by these works Arnold set much store. The appearance of these three works in their best textual dress, is, then, a matter of moment to the historian of English culture or of English literature.

In the collected edition, they appear in the text of the last standard editions published in Arnold's life-time. Messrs. John Murray continue to reprint them, in single volumes, from the popular editions. Which alternative is to be preferred? One is at first tempted to an evasive reply. Let the historian of literature read these works in their popular editions in which their form has a last added burnish ; let the historian of culture read them rather in their standard editions where their wealth of matter is integrally conserved.

This answer is not without force : the formal modifications introduced into the text of the popular editions are mainly corrective, and the material modifications mainly adaptative. Exceptions to this major distinction are few.

Can nothing better be done for Matthew Arnold? Perhaps. I tentatively propose that a composite text be prepared in which the text of the last standard edition published in the life-time of the author, be the base, and the reading of popular editions be preferred when it is corrective not adaptative, and when, furthermore, the correction squares with the principles of revision to which Matthew Arnold was faithful in his modification of one standard edition for another. I give an example. The sumptuous conclusion of *St. Paul and Protestantism* gave Arnold a deal of trouble. One sentence originally stood in part as follows : " There is Paul with the mystery... which was manifested by him for some half score years. " For the third edition, the last standard edition, " manifested " was superseded by " uncovered " ; and for the subsequent popular edition " uncovered " was replaced by " brought to the light ". It is unjust to Matthew Arnold to perpetuate the intermediate reading, less attractive than either the anterior or the posterior, a groping and no more. I take another instance from the same passage, from its introductory sentence. In his periodical version, Arnold wrote : " let us turn again for a moment " ; from the text of the first edition in book-form he suppressed " again " ; into the text of the third he reintroduced it ; in the text of the popular edition he condensed the phrase to " let us return ". The term of the process is the popular edition.

APPENDIX

LITERATURE AND DOGMA AND THE CORNHILL MAGAZINE

The first version of *Literature and Dogma* presents a disturbing problem. What Arnold originally intended that this version, the periodical version, should be he indicated in a passage at the end of the first paper. This passage, omitted from the subsequent versions runs :

And this we propose to do in three or four attempts which, perhaps, if they were novels and we were Mr. Disraeli, we should call a trilogy or tetralogy, but which they and we being what we are, we shall call simply three or four essays, one of them (which we shall have to divide into two parts) dealing with literature as it regards dogma ; another with literature as it regards physics ; a third with literature as it regards science generally¹.

The clear programme announced with such nonchalance was not fulfilled. Only two ' essays ' appeared in the *Cornhill Magazine* — the paper from which these lines are taken appeared in July 1871, and another appeared in the following October. The second paper terminated with this passage, also omitted from subsequent versions : ' But to finish our defence of literature against dogma we need one paper more ; and perhaps our remarks on miracles will come better at the beginning of that than at the end of this² '. This passage gives two items of important information. Matthew Arnold's thought had already submerged the limits of the programme he had announced three months before. He had discovered that the first of the three subjects with which he was to concern himself, — the relation of literature and dogma — would require at least three papers. And, despite this enlargement of his original plan, he was preparing to go forward, possibly to deal with literature and physics and with literature and science generally, possibly merely to complete his consideration of literature and dogma.

1. *Cornhill Magazine*, vol. xxiv, p, 47. — 2. *Id.*, p. 492.

This second paper was however the last of the series. In the light of the sentence quoted from it, it is certain that Arnold intended to print in the *Cornhill* at least one more paper. The inference which suggests itself at once is that the editors or publishers declined to print the article on miracles which he announced and which doubtless was very similar to the chapter of the book *Literature and Dogma* entitled *The Proof from Miracles*.

For such an inference there is a fair amount of support apart from its inherent likelihood. Up to the appearance of the two papers on *Literature and Dogma* the *Cornhill* had been Arnold's chief vehicle of periodical publication : in it had appeared *On Translating Homer*, *The Study of Celtic Literature*, some of the *Essays in Criticism*, *Culture and Anarchy* and *St. Paul and Protestantism*. After October, 1871, little of Arnold's work appeared in the *Cornhill*. *A Persian Passion Play* appeared in December 1871 ; but arrangements for its publication may well have been made prior to the reception of the announced third article in the series on *Literature and Dogma*. A poem *New Rome* was printed in 1873 ; and in 1879 *A Speech at Eton*. This is all. In sending *New Rome* to his brother who was to give it to George Smith for the *Cornhill*, he writes on May 5, 1873 :

I wish you would look in in Fenchurch St. on George Smith (I think 136 is the number, but you will easily find out) and tell him I now give up hearing from him but all he has got for me had better go to the Athenaeum where I shall find it at my return. Tell him that as a proof of the indestructible sweetness of my disposition, and of my viewing his conduct with sorrow rather than anger I send him the enclosed trifle for the *Cornhill*, which I think rather good ; and verses I do not often bestow on the public now³.

The conduct of George Smith to which Arnold here alludes may well have been in relation to the articles on *Literature and Dogma*. *New Rome* (if *A Persian Passion Play* was, as has been suggested, printed before the third article on *Literature and Dogma* was submitted) was Arnold's first contribution to the *Cornhill* since the series had been cut short⁴.

3. *Letters*, (ed. Russell), vol. II, p. 403. — 4. It should also be noted that *Literature and Dogma* is the sole book of which only a fraction appeared in a periodical.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography lists the works in prose of Matthew Arnold of which more than one version appeared in his lifetime. His writings on education are omitted.

Essays in Criticism :

The essays composing the first edition in book-form appeared as follows :

The Function of Criticism at the Present Time. (*The National Review*, November, 1864, under the title *The Functions of Criticism at the Present Time.*)

The Literary Influence of Academies. (*The Cornhill Magazine*, August, 1864.)

MAURICE DE GUÉRIN. — (*Fraser's Magazine*, January, 1863.)

EUGÉNIE DE GUÉRIN. — (*The Cornhill Magazine*, June, 1863.)

HEINRICH HEINE. — (*The Cornhill Magazine*, August, 1863.)

Pagan and Mediaeval Religious Sentiment. (*The Cornhill Magazine*, April, 1864, under the title *Pagan and Christian Religious Sentiment.*)

JOUBERT. — (*The National Review*, January, 1864, under the title *Joubert ; or, a French Coleridge.*)

SPINOZA. — (*Macmillan's Magazine*, December, 1863, under the title *A Word More about Spinoza.*)

MARCUS AURELIUS. — (*The Victoria Magazine*, November, 1863.)

First Edition (with *Preface*) : Macmillan and Co. 1865.

Second Edition (with *Preface*) : Macmillan and Co. 1869.

The essay on *Spinoza*, was enlarged by the inclusion of much material from the article *The Bishop and The Philosopher* (*Macmillan's Magazine*, January, 1863), and was re-named *Spinoza and the Bible.*

Third Edition (with *Preface*) : Macmillan and Co. 1875.

Between the essay on *Pagan and Mediaeval Religious Sentiment* and that on *Joubert* was inserted an essay on *A Persian Passion Play.* (*The Cornhill Magazine*, December, 1871.)

Fourth Edition (with *Preface*) : Macmillan and Co. 1884.

On the Study of Celtic Literature :

The articles composing this work appeared in *The Cornhill Magazine* for March, April, May and July, 1866.

First Edition (with Introduction) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1867.
Second Edition (with Introduction), entitled *The Study of Celtic Literature* : Smith, Elder and Co. 1891*.

Culture and Anarchy :

The articles composing this work appeared in *The Cornhill Magazine* for July 1867, January, February, June, July and August, 1868, the first article entitled *Culture and its Enemies* and the others *Anarchy and Authority*.

First Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1869.

Second Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1875.

Third Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1882.

St. Paul and Protestantism : with an Introduction on Puritanism and the Church of England.

The articles composing this work appeared in *The Cornhill Magazine* : *Puritanism and the Church of England* in February, 1870, *St. Paul and Protestantism* in October and November, 1869.

First Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1870.

Second Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1870.

The essay on *Puritanism and the Church of England* in this edition followed, instead of introducing the study of *St. Paul and Protestantism*. The word « introduction » in the title was accordingly altered to « essay ».

Third Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1875.

Popular Edition (with new Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1887.

The essay which appeared as a preface in earlier editions was now entitled *Modern Dissent* and followed the essay *Puritanism and the Church of England*. An essay entitled *A Comment on Christmas* (*The Contemporary Review*, April, 1885) now followed *Modern Dissent*.

Friendship's Garland :

The letters and study which composed this work appeared as follows.

Twelve letters in *The Pall Mall Gazette* for July 21, August 4, 7, 15, November 8, 1866; April 20, 22, 1867; June 8, 1869; August 9, November 21, 25, 29, 1870; *My Countrymen* in *The Cornhill Magazine*, April, 1866**; and *A Courteous Explanation* in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, March 20, 1866.

First Edition : Smith, Elder and Co. 1871.

Literature and Dogma : an Essay towards a Better Apprehension of the Bible.

First Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1873.

The Introduction and first chapter appeared in *The Cornhill Magazine*, July, 1871, the second, third and fourth chapters in the same, October, 1871.

* This posthumous edition is listed on account of certain minute changes mentioned on page 14.

** Smart erroneously assigns this article to the issue of February, 1866.

Second Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1873.
Third Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1873.
Fourth Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1874.
Fifth Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1875.
Popular Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1883.

God and the Bible : A Review of Objections to Literature and Dogma.

The articles composing this work appeared in *The Contemporary Review*, October, November, 1874; January, March, May, July and September, 1875, under the title *Review of Objections to Literature and Dogma*.

First Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1875.

Popular Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1884.

Last Essays on Church and Religion :

The essays composing this work appeared as follows :

A Psychological Parallel. (The Contemporary Review, November, 1876.)

Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist. (The Contemporary Review, February and March, 1876.)

The Church of England. (Macmillan's Magazine, April, 1876.)

A Last Word on the Burials Bill. (Macmillan's Magazine, July, 1876.)

First Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1877.

Mixed Essays :

The essays composing this work appeared as follows :

Democracy. (The Preface to Popular Education in France, 1861.)

Equality. (The Fortnightly Review, March, 1878.)

Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism. (The Fortnightly Review, July, 1878.)

Porro Unum est Necessarium. (The Fortnightly Review, November, 1878.)

A Guide to English Literature. (The Nineteenth Century, December, 1877.)

FALKLAND. — (The Nineteenth Century, March, 1877.)

A French Critic on Milton. (Quarterly Review, January, 1877.)

A French Critic on Goethe. (Quarterly Review, January, 1878.)

GEORGE SAND. — (The Fortnightly Review, June, 1877.)

First Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1879.

Second Edition (with Preface) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1880.

Irish Essays and Others :

The essays composing this work appeared as follows :

The Incompatibles. (The Nineteenth Century, April and June, 1881.)

An Unregarded Irish Grievance. (The Fortnightly Review, August, 1881, under the title Irish Grammar Schools.)

Ecce Convertimur ad Gentes. (The Fortnightly Review, February, 1879.)

The Future of Liberalism. (The Nineteenth Century, July, 1880.)

A Speech at Eton. (The Cornhill Magazine, May, 1879.)

The French Play in London. (*The Nineteenth Century*, August, 1879.)

Copyright. (*The Fortnightly Review*, March, 1880.)

Preface to First Edition of Poems, 1853.

Preface to Second Edition of Poems, 1854.

First Edition (with *Preface*) : Smith, Elder and Co. 1882.

Discourses in America :

The essays composing this work appeared as follows :

Numbers : Or The Majority and the Remnant. (*The Nineteenth Century*, April, 1884.)

Literature and Science. (*The Nineteenth Century*, August, 1882.)

EMERSON. — (*Macmillan's Magazine*, May, 1884.)

First Edition (with *Preface*) : Macmillan and Co. 1885.

Essays in Criticism ; (Second Series.)

The essays composing this work appeared as follows :

The Study of Poetry. (*General Introduction to The English Poets* edited by T. H. Ward, 1880.)

MILTON. — (*The Century Magazine*, May, 1888.)

THOMAS GRAY. — (Ward's *The English Poets*, vol. III, 1880.)

JOHN KEATS. — (Ward's *The English Poets*, vol. IV, 1880.)

WORDSWORTH. — (*Macmillan's Magazine*, July, 1879; *Preface to The Poems of Wordsworth*, 1879.)

BYRON. — (*Macmillan's Magazine*, March, 1881; *Preface to Poetry of Byron*, 1881.)

SHELLEY. — (*The Nineteenth Century*, January, 1888.)

COUNT LEO TOLSTOÏ. — (*The Fortnightly Review*, December, 1887.)

AMIEL. — (*Macmillan's Magazine*, September, 1887.)

First Edition, (with *Prefatory Note* signed C [Lord Coleridge]), Macmillan and Co. 1888.

VU LE 29 JUIN 1934 :

*Le Doyen de la Faculté des Lettres
de l'Université de Paris,*

H. DELACROIX.

VU ET PERMIS D'IMPRIMER :

Le Recteur de l'Académie de Paris,

CHARLÉTY.

INDEX

- Addison, Joseph, 8.
 Alford, Henry, 31.
 America, 93-94, 109-117.
Anarchy and Authority, 17, 19-26, 133.
 Arminius, 43.
 Augustine, Saint, 35, 53, 65.
- Bacon, Francis, 112, 114.
 Bain, James, 7.
 Bateson, Sir Thomas, 27.
 Bazley, T, 27.
 Beach, J. W., 112-113.
 Beecher, H. W., 4.
 Belot, Adolphe, 86.
 Bentham, Jeremy, 4, 7.
Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist, 88, 90, 134.
 Bismarck, 41-42, 43, 98.
 Bossuet, 63, 65.
Bottles, 43.
 Bradlaugh, Charles, 27.
 Bright, Jacob, 27.
 Bright, John, 19, 27, 30, 111.
 Browning, Oscar, 28-29.
 Browning, Robert, 43.
 Burke, Edmund, 103.
 Burnouf, Emile, 70-71.
 Butler, Joseph (Bishop), 53, 65, 89-90.
 Buxton, Charles, 27, 31.
 Byron, 112, 119-120, 121, 122-123.
Byron, 119, 122-123, 135.
- Cambridge, 14-16, 109-111.
 Catholicism, 6, 30, 37, 53, 64, 95.
 Cattle, Rev. W [Cassel], 27.
Century Magazine, 119, 135.
 Chaucer, 107.
 Chesterton, G. K., 22.
Church of England, The, 88, 134.
 Cicero, 56, 114.
 Colenso, J. W. (Bishop), 5, 11, 22, 83.
 Coleridge, John Duke (Lord), 118, 135.
 Coleridge, S. T., 11-12, 15-16.
- Comment on Christmas*, 4, 33, 39, 133.
 Comte, Auguste, 19, 21-22.
Contemporary Review, 33, 79, 88, 96.
 Copyright, 100, 107, 135.
Cornhill Magazine, 1-2, 14, 17, 18, 33, 40, 46, 106, 130-131.
Count Leo Tolstoy, 119, 135.
 Cowper, William, 63.
Culture and Anarchy, 4, 6, 16-32, 93, 133.
Culture and its Enemies, 17-19, 133.
- Dante, 105-106, 122.
Democracy, 91, 92-94, 134.
 Digeon, A. 124, 128.
 Diggs, Zephaniah, 43.
Discourses in America, 109-117, 135.
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 68, 80, 110.
 Dixon, Hepworth, 43.
- Ecce Convertimur ad Gentes*, 100, 104-106, 134.
 Education, 14-16, 17-18, 26, 28-29, 109-111.
 Elcho, Lord, 27.
 Emerson, 109, 114-117.
 England, 3, 7, 26, 34, 58, 93, 94.
Epistle to the Hebrews, 31-32, 34.
Equality, 91, 94-95, 134.
Essays in Criticism, First Series, 1-13, 45, 132.
Essays in Criticism, Second Series, 118-123, 135.
 Eugénie de Guérin, 4, 9, 127, 132.
- Fact, Errors of, 5, 34, 36, 62, 66, 69, 71, 76, 82, 98, 127.
Falkland, 91, 96-97, 134.
 Fawcett, Professor, 38-39.
Fortnightly Review, 91-92, 98-99, 100, 119.
 France, 41, 77, 94, 107, 119-120.
 Francis of Assisi, Saint, 12, 30.

- Francis of Sales, Saint, 65.
 Fraser, Rev. James, 42.
Fraser's Magazine, 1.
French Critic on Gæthe, A, 91, 97-98, 126, 134.
French Critic on Milton, A, 91, 97, 134.
French Play in London, The, 100, 107, 135.
Friendship's Garland, 40-45, 93, 133.
Function of Criticism at the Present Time, The, 1, 5, 8, 132.
Future of Liberalism, The, 100, 106, 134.
 Generosity, Instances of, 38-39, 42, 43-44, 58-64, 66, 74-75, 104.
 George Sand, 92, 98-99, 126, 127, 134.
 Germany, 41-42.
 Gladstone, W. E., 25, 80-81, 113.
God and the Bible, 54, 68, 79-87, 134.
 Gæthe, 56, 97-98, 119-120, 122.
 Gray, David, 9.
 Gray, Thomas, 119.
 Guérin, Eugénie de, 9.
 Guérin, Maurice de, 9-10.
Guide to English Literature, A, 91, 96, 134.
 Guyau, J.-M., 121.
 Harrison, Frederic, 21-22, 89, 101.
 Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 115.
 Heine, 10.
Heinrich Heine, 1, 10, 132.
 Herbert, George, 105.
Hiawatha, 111.
 Hobbes, Thomas, 7, 90.
 Hugo, Victor, 113, 119-120.
 Huxley, T. H., 110-111, 113.
Incompatibles, The, 100-104, 134.
 Ireland, 96, 100-104.
Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism, 91, 95, 134.
Irish Essays and Others, 100-108, 134-135.
Irish Grammar Schools, 100, 134.
 Irony, 5, 8, 9, 19, 27, 38, 43, 58, 59, 60, 64, 82, 106.
 Isaiah, 51, 62.
 Jesus, 46-47, 51-52, 61, 62-63, 73, 77-78.
John Keats, 119, 132.
 Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 43.
 Joubert, Joseph, 11-12, 45.
Joubert; or a French Coleridge, 1, 11-12, 132.
 Keats, John, 9-10, 119.
 Kinglake, A. W., 8-9, 14-15.
 Koszul, A, 122.
 Lacordaire, 30.
Last Essays on Church and Religion, 88-90, 134.
Last Word on the Burials Bill, A, 88, 134.
 Legouis, Emile, 120.
 Liberalism, 25-26, 30-31, 106.
Literary Influence of Academies, The, 1, 8-9, 45, 132.
Literature and Dogma, 46-78, 79, 83, 113, 133.
Literature and Science, 109, 110-114, 135.
 Locke, John, 7.
 Lowe, Robert, 4, 16.
 Luther, 12, 34, 65.
 Macchiavelli, 56-57.
Macmillan's Magazine, 1, 88, 109, 119.
Marcus Aurelius, 12-13, 132.
 Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, 12-13, 81.
Maurice de Guérin, 1, 9-10, 127, 132.
 Maurice, F. D., 83.
 Mill, J. S., 7, 28.
 Milman, Dean, 31.
 Milnes, R. M. (Lord Houghton), 9.
Milton, 118, 135.
Mixed Essays, 91-99, 134.
Modern Dissent, 33, 38-39, 133.
 Molière, 122.
My Countrymen, 40, 44-45, 133.
National Review, 1.
 Newman, J. H. (Cardinal), 16, 17, 68.
Nineteenth Century, 91, 100, 109, 119.
 Norton, C. E., 82, 109.
Numbers : or the Majority and the Remnant, 109-110, 135.
 Opinion, Modifications of, 9, 10, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 51, 56, 57, 58, 62, 64, 69, 70, 86, 88, 89, 90, 93, 94, 96, 97, 101, 102, 103, 104, 107, 108, 114, 115, 116, 118, 122, 123.
 « Ossian », 29.
 Oxford, 14-16, 17-18, 19, 110-111.
Pagan and Mediæval Religious Sentiment, 1, 12, 132.
 Palgrave, F. T., 8.
Pall Mall Gazette, The, 40, 104.
 Pascal, Blaise, 114.
 Paul, Saint, 13, 34-36.
Persian Passion Play, A, 2, 13, 132.
 Plato, 56, 109, 114.
Poems of Wordsworth, 119, 122.
Poetry of Byron, 119, 122-123.
Porro Unum est Necessarium, 91, 95-96, 134.

Prose Passages, 128.
Psychological Parallel, A, 88-89, 134.
Puritanism, 24-25, 27, 29-30, 34-36, 96-97.
Puritanism and the Church of England,
 33, 37-38, 134.

Quarterly Review, 28, 29, 91, 134.
 Quillinan, Jemima, 43-44.

Renan, Ernest, 8, 36-37, 62, 119-121.
*Review of Objections to Literature and
 Dogma*, A, 79, 134.
 Roe, F. C., 121.

Saint-Hilaire, Barthélemy, 57.
 St. Paul and Protestantism, 33-39,
 113, 133.
 Saintsbury, George, 5, 91.
 Sand, George, 98-99.
Saturday Review, The, 2, 7.
 Schérer, Edmond, 97-98, 120, 126.
 Shaftesbury (the 5th Earl), 74, 75, 76,
 77, 83.
 Shakespeare, 56, 120, 122.
 Shelley, 96, 123.
Shelley, 118-119, 135.
 Simeon Charles, 112.
 Smith, George (of Smith Elder), 131.
 Smith, Goldwin, 96.
 Smith, John (the Latitudinarian), 89.
 Smith, William (of the *Quarterly Review*),
 28-29.
 Sophocles, 31.
Spinoza, 10-11, 132.
Spinoza and the Bible, 2, 10-11, 132.
 Spurgeon, Charles, 4, 30.
 Stokes, Whitley, 16.
 Strauss, Richard (the Biblical scholar), 62.
Study of Celtic Literature, On the, 14-
 16, 58, 132-133.

Style :

General remarks, 12, 42-43, 46, 47-48,
 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60,
 63-64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 73, 74, 76,
 77, 78, 82, 86, 89, 98, 102, 104, 113,
 114, 116, 117, 120, 124-127, 129.

Style :

Emphasis, 43, 61, 71, 72, 102, 125-126.
 Grace, 50, 62, 98, 116-117, 124-125.
 Rhythm, 52, 59, 66, 71, 76, 78, 102.
 Simplification, 26-27, 37, 57, 116.
Supernatural Religion, 80-81, 84-85.
 Suppressions, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14-
 16, 18, 19, 21-22, 23, 24, 25-26, 28-29.
 29-31, 40-41, 42, 44, 68-78, 79-80, 81,
 83-85, 92, 93, 94, 96, 98, 103, 105-106,
 110, 111, 112, 115, 118, 119-120.
 Swift, Jonathan, 114.
 Taine, Hippolyte, 121.
 Tauler, Johann, 65.
 Tennyson, Alfred, 3, 105.
 Theocritus, 12.
 Thiers, Adolphe, 41.
Times, The, 8, 44, 111.
 Tollemache, Lionel, 101.
 Tulloch, Principal John, 88-89.

Unregarded Irish Grievance, An, 100,
 104, 134.
 Universities, 14-16, 18.

Victoria Magazine, 1.
 Voltaire, 107-108, 114.

Walton, Izaak, 31.
 Wesley, John, 30, 36.
Westminster Review, 80.
 Wilberforce, Samuel (Bishop of Win-
 chester), 49, 58, 64, 66, 75, 80, 83.
 Wilson, Thomas (Bishop of Sodor and
 Man), 49, 35, 65.
 Wood, Sir William Page, 27.
Word More About Spinoza, A, 1, 10-11,
 132.
 Wordsworth, William, 120-122, 123.
Wordsworth, 119, 120-122, 135.
 Wotton, Sir Henry, 30.
 Wright, Thomas, 3-4.

Zola, Emile, 86.

